A DEFENCE OF THE ANTIQUITY OF THE Royal Line OF SCOTLAND.

WITH

A true Account when the *Scots* were govern'd by Kings in the Isle of *Britain*.

By Sir GEORGE MACKENZIE His *Majesty*'s Advocate in *Scotland*.

LONDON:
Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard. M.DC.LXXXV.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

ANTIQUITY

OF THE

ROYAL LINE

OF

SCOTLAND.

To the KING.

SIR,

DIvine Providence having ſuffered theſe Kingdoms to deſtroy one another for many Ages, in divided Monarchies; reſerv'd their happy Union for the Merciful Royal Family, of which *Your Majeſty* is now the *Head*: and mingl'd lawfully in their Veins, all thoſe many and different Bloods-Royal, which pretended to any Soveraignty in theſe your Dominions: deſigning thereby at once to reward the Vertue of Your *Majeſty*'s Predeceſſors, and to endear that Union to us, in preventing future Debates. In King *James*, Your Royal Grand-Father, theſe Nations got

v. *The laſt four pages of the Book.*

a Monarch, who was acknowledg'd to be the *Solomon* of His Age: who excell'd all His Contemporary Princes in * King-Craft; all his Miniſters in Prudence; and all His Doctors in Learning. None of his Subjects underſtood the Law better, or obſerv'd it more: and who knew as well all that was done at Council-Tables abroad, as they who ſat at them. To Him ſucceeded *Your Majeſty's Royal Father*, whoſe Life was the beſt Law a King could make: who knew no uſe of Power, ſave to do good by it: who was leſs careful of His own Blood, than of that of his Subjects: And I may juſtly ſay, that Heaven only was govern'd by a better King. After we had ſhown our ſelves unworthy of ſuch Monarchs, the Divine Goodneſs, to try us once more,

* *His own word.*

more, gave us *Your Gracious Brother*, whose Clemency (after so many and so great Injuries) was as great a Miracle as His Restoration: who knew every thing save to be severe; and could bear every thing, save to see His People in trouble: who after the abuse of His Goodness, had made his Enemies so insolent, that His Servants concluded all was lost; did, by His extraordinary parts, with a gentle easiness, peculiar to Himself, dissipate those execrable Combinations, to our great satisfaction and amazement. But, *Sir*, the Conscience of His Enemies, will far exceed in His Praises, the Eloquence of His Servants; and so my trembling Hand leaves this Melancholy Subject.

His

His Throne is now fill'd with *Your Sacred Majeſty*, whoſe Abilities Your Royal Brother eſteemed ſo much, that He ſhar'd with You the Exerciſe of the Government, before His Death gave you the Poſſeſſion of the Crown. In You, *Sir*, Your People have a *General* to their *Armies*, an *Admiral* to their *Fleet*, a *Treaſurer* to their *Mony*: whoſe Courage can lead them as far as theirs can follow; and raiſe the Glory of theſe Kingdoms as high as they can wiſh: So that if they be not happy, they will have this Addition to their Misfortunes, that the World will ſee, that they themſelves are only to be blam'd for it.

Our Country, *Sir*, does not boaſt of a rich Soil, or a hot Sun: but it may, that it has given theſe happy

happy Islands those Gracious and Glorious Kings. In return whereof, we might have expected kinder Rewards, than that any of their Natives should debate its Antiquity, and the Veracity of those Histories wherein the great Actions of Your Royal Predecessors were recorded. And since the Honour of the Ancient and Royal Race of our Soveraigns is the chief thing wherein we Glory; it is hard to deny us a Favour, so just on our part, and so easy on theirs. However, *Sir*, since I presume, that those of Your other Subjects, who controvert this, do so, rather from want of information, than from unkindness; I, who am resolv'd to make the defence of Your meanest Priviledges my greatest Honour, have thought it incumbent to me, as *Your Advocate*, to

212

undertake the defence of that Antiquity, which makes *Your Majesty* the most Ancient Monarch upon Earth. Which Argument, I hope, I have manag'd with that Candour, which becomes an honest Man, and that Zeal which is the Duty of,

SIR,

Your Majesty's most Dutiful,

Loyal, and Obedient

Subject and

Servant,

Geo. Mackenzie.

A LETTER to the

EARL of *PERTH*,

Lord High Chancellor of

SCOTLAND,

Upon his having ſent to the Author the Biſhop of St. Aſaph's *Book. With ſome Reflections upon the Deſign of that Book.*

My Lord,

I Have read the *Book* you ſent me, with that delight I did of old a *Play*; which one may think it reſembles more, than our Hiſtories do a Romance: For what is truly related, is ſo diſguiſed and tranſpoſed, as may beſt ſuit with the Author's Deſign; and with a Rhetorick ſo Polite and Comical, that if the Reaſons do not convince, yet the Hu-

mour and Stile may charm, and pleaſe, even ſome of thoſe againſt whom it is deſign'd. This made me unwilling at firſt to undertake to anſwer a Book, which I ſuppoſe might have more Admirers than Proſelytes: but finding, upon a ſecond peruſal, that the Author had not fully examined the Grounds upon which our Hiſtorians proceeded, or had ſuffered himſelf to be byaſs'd by Zeal for his Order, or Partiality to his Country; And that this whole Kingdom take it as an Injury done, not only to the Antiquity of the *Royal Family*, but to this our Nation in general; I was at laſt prevailed with to enter the Liſts, with a kind Deſign, by a ſober and candid Information, rather to convince and ſatisfy the Author, and thoſe he may have miſled, than to acquire the vain glory of ſuch a Victory, eſpecially over one who bears the Character of a Biſhop, for which I have ſo great a Veneration: Altho, for the Reaſons following, I cannot but diſlike his unneceſſary Undertaking, and unſeaſonable and partial Management of a National Debate,

which

which * we are prohibited to enter upon under pain of a Sedition. *Ja.6.Par.20. c.9.

1. I am ſorry, that while theſe Kingdoms are unhappily divided, not in Nations, but Opinions; the old Animoſities amongſt Scots, Engliſh, and Iriſh, being forgot and buried, and the modern Differences between the *Epiſcopal* and *Fanatick*, and *Cavalier* and *Republican*, or, as ſome term it, *Whig* and *Tory*, are ſo violent and turbulent; the Author ſhould have diverted our juſt and dutiful Zeal, by imploying it in defence of an important right of *State*, unkindly, as well as unneceſſarily invaded: ſo as the other, of near concern to the Church, may in ſome meaſure come to be neglected.

2. The pretext for writing this Book, wherein the Antiquity of our Kings and Nation is ſo much diſparag'd, being, that the *Presbyterians*, and particularly *Blondel*, urg'd from our Hiſtorians, that we had a Church for ſome Years without Biſhops: it ſeem'd neither juſt nor fit, that any Epiſcopal Author ſhould have magnify'd ſo highly the meaneſt Argument that ever was us'd by a *Presbyterian*;

terian; as for it, to cut off 44 *Kings* (all preceding *Coranus*, who began his Reign *anno* 501) and to expose on a *Pillory* as *Forgers*, our many and grave *Historians*. And that it is a weak Argument, appears from this, that I have met with very few *Laicks* in all our Country, who had heard of it; nor with one, even of these few, who had valu'd it: and so this Author may be said, rather to have suggested a new Argument, than to have answered an old One: For they urge now nothing to us, save places of Scripture; resolving to have their *Presbytery*, *Juris Divini*: knowing that nothing less can secure them, in opposing the Laws of the Kingdom. And what can the *Presbyterians* think of their other Arguments, which they value much. Since this, which they valu'd so little, is thought of such force, by a learned Bishop, as to deserve a whole Book, the cutting off of 44 *Kings*, and the offending a *Nation of Friends*. It is also very remarkable, that the learn'd Doctor *Hammond*, a great Champion of *Episcopacy*, owns the Antiquity of our *Nation*:

Nation; and answers fully that Argument, without overturning the truth of our History, or wronging the Antiquity of *our Royal-Line*: whereas *Baxter* the *Presbyterian* urges this Citation, and yet agrees with this Author in opposing the Antiquity of our History; approving what is said by *Cambden* and *Usher*; and in a Letter to the Duke of *Lauderdale* asserting the lateness of our settlement here. Which shews, that there is no necessity lying upon such as own *Episcopacy*, to wrong the Antiquity of our *Kings* and *Nation*. But how the necessity of a private corner of a remote Country in *Ecclesiâ constituendâ*, could wrong the general practice of the *Church*; is as little to be understood, as it is undenyable, that many thousands in *Japan*, and *China*, were converted by *Presbyters*, before *Bishops* were sent thither. And since it cannot be deny'd, but that those who ordain'd our *Presbyters* were *Bishops*; it necessarily follows, that *Episcopacy* was settl'd in the *Christian Church* before we had *Presbyters* or *Culdees*: or else, if these who ordain'd our

Presbyters were not *Bishops*, the practice of that *Church*, whereby our *Presbyters* were ordain'd, should have been impugn'd, and not the *Authority* of our *Histories*, and the *Antiquity* of *our Royal-Line* overturn'd. And though this Reverend and Learn'd *Author* could prove, that we were not setled here, before the Year 503, yet that could not answer the Argument: for the *Culdees* might have been settled before that time in this Country, where we now live, though amongst the *Picts*; for it cannot be deny'd but the *Picts* were setled in this Country before that time. And when our Historians say that the *Abbots* of *Icolm-kill* had Jurisdiction over all the *Bishops* of the *Province*; that is to be understood, as *Beda* observes, *more inusitato*; and my Lord St. *Asaph* himself well remarks these words, and gives a full and clear vindication of the passages of *Beda* in the 173, and following *Pages*; and might have rested therein, and needed not to have been driven to seek a new Answer in overturning the Antiquity of our Nation. Many examples can

can be given of Juriſdiction of *Preſbyters*, and even of *Deacons* over *Biſhops* in the *Canon Law* and *Hiſtory*. So that this inſtance from our Hiſtorians makes nothing againſt *Epiſcopacy*. And latter *Hiſtorians* meeting with theſe ambiguous words in our *Annals*, *De ſignatus*, *Electus*, *Ordinatus*, were by a miſtake induc'd to appropriate theſe words to the formal Ceremony of *Ordination and Impoſition of Hands*. And I find, by the Biſhop's Conceſſion, * that the *Abbeſs Hilda* did elect and ſend forth ſuch of her Monks, as ſhe thought fit to be ordain'd: which is all that our *Culdees*, and ancient Monks did. Thus a King may be ſaid to make one a Biſhop, or a Mother to have made one of her Sons a Church-man; which anſwer, the learned *Nicol*, a zealous friend to *Epiſcopacy*, thought ſufficient to elide *Blondel*'s Arguments from our Hiſtorians, without denying the Antiquity of our Nation, or troubling himſelf with our * *Culdees*. And if *Beda* had heard that the Preſbyters did ordain Biſhops, he had remark'd it as a moſt unuſual

* Pag. 169, 170. 171.

* See his late Book, entituled, *Les pretendus reformees convanious du Schiſm*, p. 547. 548, 549, 550.

unuſal thing, having marked that the Abbots had juriſdiction over Biſhops, they being but Presbyters; ſuch an Ordination being much more extraordinary, than ſuch a Juriſdiction. And might not my Lord St. *Aſaph* as well have inveigh'd againſt *Gildas* and the Britiſh Hiſtorians, becauſe he ſays * that Church-men were ordain'd by the conſent of the Biſhops and the reſt of the *Presbyters*, from which *Presbyterians*, and particularly the ſame, *Blondel* † infers a parity betwixt Biſhops and Preſbyters. And from which it appears, that dangerous Conſequences ſhould not be drawn from the dubious and heedleſs expreſſions of old Authors, living in rude Times and Places: and from all which we might have been ſecure, that my Lord St. *Aſaph* would have concur'd with the wiſe anſwer, which *Spotſwood*, Arch-Biſhop of St. *Andrews* (with whom the learn'd *Hammond* agrees) gave to that ſilly Argument, without affronting him as a betrayer of the Epiſcopal Cauſe; and careſſing our *Fanaticks* by that unwarrantable and dangerous aſſertion; *that in conſequence*

* Pag. 89.

† Pag. 72, 73.

quence thereof they might reaſonably conclude, that when they covenanted againſt Epiſcopacy, *they had only us'd their own right; and thrown out that, which was a confeſs'd innovation; in order to the reſtoring of that, which was their primitive Government.* For it does not follow, that becauſe our Church in its infancy and neceſſity was without Biſhops for ſome Years; that therefore it was reaſonable for Subjects, to enter into a *Solemn Leagne* and *Covenant*, without, and againſt the conſent of their *Monarch*; and to extirpate Epiſcopacy ſettled then by Law, and by an old preſcription of 1200 Years at leaſt.

3. Precedency being one of the Jewels of the Crown and one of the chief Glories of Princes; and all who treat on that Subject confeſſing, that the King of *Great-Britain*, as King of *Scotland*, is the moſt ancient Monarch in *Europe*, the Line of other Kingdoms having been often interrupted, whereas ours never was; it ſeems a great injury to our Kings, to have their Line ſhortened, ſo as thereby to poſtpone them, to many others; and if this

Author's

Author's Arguments prove any thing, they muſt prove that our Kings cannot inſtruct their Antiquity, till *Malcolm* the 3*d's* Time: and ſo our Kings will be amongſt the laſt of all *Crowned-Heads*. Nor is it one of the leaſt Arguments, which prevail with us, to hazard all for our *Royal-Line*, that we have been ſo long Subjects to it, and happy under it: and therefore whoever ſhortens it, leſſens (though without deſign) the influence of our Kings, and endangers the Succeſſion. And ſince * *Luddus* owns, that he durſt not deny the Britiſh Deſcent from *Brutus*, leſt he might thereby wrong the *Majeſty* of the Engliſh Nation; I admire, that any of the Subjects of *Great Britain* did not think it a degree of *Leſe-Majeſty*, to injure and ſhorten the *Royal-Line* of their Kings.

* Pag. 2.

4. If this injury had been done to Kings, or to a Nation, when they were Enemies to *Epiſcopacy*, as the Obligation was, ſo the fault had been leſs. But to inveigh againſt our *Royal-Line*, after King *James* had made the ſettlement of *Epiſcopacy* his

his buſineſs; King *Charles* had died for it; and our late Soveraign of Glorious Memory, had been more diſquieted by the Schiſmatical oppoſition made to it, than by all his other concerns, ſeems very unkind. And tho this learned and worthy *Author*, upon deſign to make us ſit down quietly under theſe Injuries, ſeems to gratifie us, by the Complement, "That we, ſince the Writing of our "Hiſtories, needed not ſuch helps, "as old and fabulous Romances: "telling us, that we have excell'd "moſt other Nations, in Arts, and "Arms; and eſpecially in the Purity "of Religion, abating only the ble-"miſh, which we have contracted "by too eaſie a belief of theſe Ficti-"ons, which he deſigns to Refute. Yet, ſince no Peer in *England*, though a Subject, would have allow'd this Author to tell him, that albeit, he be now a brave and generous Perſon; his Predeceſſors were lately pilfering barbarous Robbers and Vagabonds, and the Hiſtory of his Family a fabulous Romance. How ſhould he have imagin'd, that our Kings and Nation

on (how gentle ſoever) would have thought, that the Juſtice done them in this Age (and for which we thank the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*) ſhould have compens'd the Injuries done to their Predeceſſors?

But it is probable, that my Lord St. *Aſaph* has not, on the one hand, known the Grounds which we here urge for our Antiquity, and that our nice Jealouſie for our Honour, on the other hand, magnifies too much to us ſuch injuries, of which we are naturally very ſenſible: and therefore, I hope, by his Lordſhip's aquieſcence, the reſult of the Debate will be, that he will ſee that our *Royal-Line* and *Nation* are more ancient than he imagined them to have been: and that we will remain convinc'd, that his Book was not dictated by malice, and National Humour.

My Deſign is not to convince my Readers, that I am Learn'd, but that my Cauſe is juſt: and therefore I uſe no more Citations, even from the Books I know, than may prove or illuſtrate my Poſitions.

And,

And, not being the first aggressor, I expect the favour which is due to Self-defence: For of all things, I hate unnecessary Debates; and I admire St. *Paul*, for saying, * *And they neither found me in the Temple disputing with any Man.* Debates generally starve Charity, feed Self-love, and incline even very good Men to more partiality, than I hope can be charg'd in this Debate, upon

* Acts 24. 12.

I

Your Lordship's most

faithful and humble

Servant,

Geo. Mackenzie.

King

King CHARLES *the* 1*ſt his Speech to the Scottiſh Parliament at* Edinburgh, *Aug.* 19. 1641.

I Cannot doubt of ſuch real Teſtimonies of your Affections, for the maintenance of that Royal Power which I enjoy, after 108 Deſcents, and which you profeſs to maintain, and to which your National Oath doth oblige you, *&c.*

A

Defence *of the* Antiquity

OF THE

Royal-Line

OF

SCOTLAND,

With a true Account, when the *Scots* were govern'd by *Kings* in the Iſle of *Britain.*

In Anſwer to the Biſhop of St. Aſaph.

ALL the Hiſtorians of *Scotland* unanimouſly agreeing, that the Royal-Line of the *Kings* of *Scoland* did begin in *King Fergus* the Firſt: and that the *Scots* now inhabiting it, were ſettled here, un-

der one *Soveraign*, about 330 years before *Chriſt*. And their Hiſtories being receiv'd with great applauſe for many hundreds of years, by *Hiſtorians*, *Antiquaries*, and *Criticks* of other Nations, who had any occaſion to take notice of our Affairs; *Luddus* affecting Singularity, did, *Anno* 1572, controvert both theſe Points: for which, he having been refuted with juſt ſeverity by *Buchannan*; the *Biſhop* of St. *Aſaph*, upon pretext of anſwering a very ſilly an inconſequential Argument againſt *Epiſcopacy*, has undertaken the Defence of *Luddus* his Kinſman, contending, that the *Scots* did not ſettle in *Britain* till the year of our *Lord* 503, and that they had no *King*, who govern'd in this Iſland till that time.

Albeit there be other unwarrantable aſſertions and poſitions in that Book, yet being unwilling to enter upon any Argument, which may, by the remoteſt Conſequence, be urg'd againſt that *Epiſcopacy*, which I ſo much reverence; I, as his *Majeſties Advocate*, deſign only to prove, that in both theſe Points the *Biſhop* has

has (though I hope without design) injur'd our *Kings* and *Nation*. For proving whereof,

The first *thing I shall clear, shall be, That History requires, nor admits no Mathematical, nor Legal Proof, but is satisfied with such Moral Certainty, as is infer'd from probable Tradition, old Manuscripts, credible Historians, the Testimony of Foreign Authors, and probable Reasons.*

Secondly; *That our Histories being already acquiesced in, and received by the generality of Mankind, and especially by* Criticks, Antiquaries, *and* Historians, *the best Judges in such cases, need no Confirmation, nor further Proof.*

Thirdly; *That albeit we are not obliged to prove, or confirm our History, yet we are able to do it by all the former* Grounds, *which is all that needs be done for the Credit of any History.*

Fourthly; *I shall answer the Arguments brought by the Bishop against our Histories. And I must intreat my Readers to lay all these together, and not to judg by parcels, which is not*

to be done, especially in cases of this nature.

SECT. I. What Proofs are necessary in History.

For clearing the first of these Points, it is fit to consider, that right Reason requires only in all cases, such Proofs, as the nature of the Subject can allow: and therefore, though *Mathematicians* rest only upon infallible Demonstrations; and the *Law* requires strict and solemn Proofs; Yet the *Law* it self remits its ordinary Exactness, to comply with the necessity of Human Affairs, allowing Domestick Witnesses, where others cannot be had, and strong presumptive Grounds as equal to Witnesses, where the Subject Matter can admit of no other Proofs: *Morality* convinces by probable Reasons, and *History* allows Moral Certainty for a sufficient Probation in matters of Fact, because the matters treated of in it, can generally admit no exacter Proofs: Which Proposition as to History, will very easily appear, if we consider, that even the Historians of this present Age, cannot themselves see every thing they relate; nor can all be prov'd

prov'd by the Teſtimony of Witneſſes. Reaſon likewiſe has oblig'd Men to preſume, that a Nation ought as much to be believ'd in theſe caſes, as two Witneſſes are in any ſingle one: for even in the caſe of Witneſſes, our belief is founded upon the preſumption, that they will not lie, and damn themſelves; and that both the one, and the other, do at laſt reſolve in preſumptive and probable Grounds: So that Men ſatisfie themſelves in moſt things, with the general Belief and Tradition of thoſe among whom they live, founded upon probable Reaſons. Manuſcripts alſo written by others, infer no Mathematical nor Legal Certainty: For the Author of the Manuſcript might have been miſtaken, or byaſs'd; and at beſt, one Witneſs proves not. Nor are Strangers oblig'd to believe the exacteſt *Hiſtory* of thoſe who write in favour of the Antiquity of their own Nation, upon any other account, than becauſe *Hiſtory* is ſatisfy'd with probable Grounds. Domeſtick Teſtimonies infer only a probable Belief; and tho an Oath were inter-

pos'd, that could creat no more than a moral Certainty.

As the former Propoſition is founded upon juſt Reaſon, ſo all *Hiſtorians* have been believ'd, and the *Hiſtories* of all Nations have been receiv'd upon probable Grounds and Warrants, though they were not written by thoſe who ſaw and heard what they wrote. Amongſt many Inſtances of which, I ſhall only name that of the *Romans*, written by * *Livius*; In which Commonwealth, he tells us that *the uſe of Letters was not then ordinary*, and that *the beſt Records were the faithful Remembrance of things paſt*; *and if ſome few Memorials were left by the Prieſts in ſucceeding Ages, they periſh'd at the burning of the Town.* And no *Hiſtory* was collected till the year 485, after the building of *Rome*, *Fabius Pictor*, their firſt *Hiſtorian*, writing in that Year, as † *Voſſius* informs us. The *Jewiſh Hiſtory* alſo had no Hiſtorical Warrant for the firſt 2000 years, but Tradition, and after that time, their Tranſactions were mention'd in very few Foreign *Hiſtories*: And the Annals of their

* *Raræ per eadem tempora litteræ fuere una cuſtodia fidelis memoriæ rerum geſtarum: & quod etiamſi quæ in commentariis Pontificum, aliiſq; publicis privatiſque erant monumentis, incenſa urbe pleraq; periere.* Liv. *Init. lib.* 6.

† Voſſius *de Hiſt. Lat. lib.* 1. *cap.* 44. *& lib.* 2.

their own *Prieſts* were thought good Hiſtorical Foundations, in the opinion of * *Joſephus*, even for the Sacred Hiſtory. I need not mention the Hiſtories of the *Greeks*, who could have no Records for many hundreds of years before they wrote; and much leſs thoſe of the *French*, and *Spaniards*, whoſe Hiſtories might much more juſtly be queſtioned upon the Grounds that ours are.

* *Lib.* 1. againſt *Appion.*

The ſureſt Foundation then of all Hiſtories, is the common belief and conſent of the Natives: For Strangers cannot know but from them, and this conſent and belief may be founded upon credible Tradition, Manuſcripts, Domeſtick Witneſſes, but eſpecially when theſe are fortify'd by the concurring Teſtimonies of Foreign Authors, probable Reaſons, and the acquieſcence of Mankind. And tho leſs accepted for fortifying an Ancient, than Modern Hiſtory, and that even a part of theſe would be ſufficient to confirm a Modern one; yet I hope to make them all concur for ſupporting ours, tho very ancient.

It would appear then by this, that as the *Biſhop* of St. *Aſaph* has undertaken to defame our Hiſtory without any neceſſity, ſo he does it without any ſhadow of Reaſon: and we will at leaſt have the ſatisfaction to ſee our Hiſtories ſubſiſt as long as any Hiſtories can do.

I conceive alſo, that in Reaſon, Hiſtorians already receiv'd in the World with Applauſe, need not ſhow their Warrants whereupon they proceed; No more than a Man that is in poſſeſſion needs prove or confirm his Right, except the ſame be prov'd to be falſe, or a clearer, or ſtronger Right be produced by him who challenges the former. Nor are Men curious to preſerve old Manuſcripts and Records, after they have form'd their Hiſtories by them: for elſe no Hiſtorian could ever be ſecure, if the not being able to ſhow their Warrants, after many Ages, might diſcredit their Hiſtory. And I deſire to know, where are theſe few Hiſtorians, whom *Herodotus*, *Livius*, and others do cite in their Hiſtories? Or, theſe whom *Joſephus* did cite to confirm that of the

the Jews, when it was challeng'd by *Appion* the *Grammarian*, upon the ſame grounds that ours is now quarrell'd by the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*? And albeit the authority of a ſingle Hiſtorian, might be ſuſpected after his Hiſtory is written, and that then his Warrants might be call'd for; eſpecially if other Manuſcripts could be found, written in the time controverted, by which that Hiſtory might be contradicted: Or if the Hiſtory controverted did report things inconſiſtent with the whole Tract of other Hiſtorians, or the Principles of common Senſe and Reaſon, as *Jeffrey* of *Monmouth*, and ſome *Britiſh* Hiſtorians do, in the opinion of theBiſhop of St. *Aſaph*, and their own beſt *Critiques*. Yet, this cannot at all be extended to our caſe, who have many Hiſtories written by Men of great Reputation, all agreeing very well with one another, and relating things probable in themſelves, and very agreeable to Foreign Hiſtories, and which they declare, they did draw from Warrants cited by them, and which have for many Years, been read

read with great pleaſure, and cited with great honour by *Critiques*, *Antiquaries*, and *Hiſtorians*, and contradicted by the authority of no poſitive Hiſtory or Manuſcript, written by any in the Ages controverted, aſſerting, that the *Scotiſh* Nation now inhabiting this Iſle, did firſt plant themſelves here, about ſuch a year of God, under ſuch a King, or adducing ſome ſuch ſolid Ground againſt us; all that is objected againſt our poſitive and applauded Hiſtories, being the vain ſcruples of an obſcure Author, *Luddus*, who being confuted by *Buchannan*, made no more noiſe in the World, till * *Cambden* rais'd ſome Conjectures with ſubmiſſion to us, after which Learned † Biſhop *Uſher* (picqu'd by *Dempſter*'s Severity, to his Uncle

* *Brittan. cap. Scoti* paſſim, but eſpecially Pag. 242. Theſe are the Points, I ſay, which I would wiſh the *Scotiſh Men* diligently to think upon; but let them remember, that in the mean time, I have affirm'd nothing, but only given an inkling of certain things, which may ſeem in ſome ſort material, whence if the Original of the *Scots* have received no Light, let them ſeek it elſewhere; and I have in vain ſearched, but with that circumſpect care, that I hope I have not given the leaſt offence to any whatſoever.

† Præfat. de primord. Eccl. Brit. *In noſtra autem ex omni Scriptorum genere promiſcuè congeſta farragine, ſiquis obſcuriorum Authorum citata mirabitur teſtimonia; Cogitare illum velim, aliud eſſe Hiſtoriam ſcribere aliud materiam hinc inde convehere, unde delectu adhibito, &c.*

Stani-

Stanihurſt) gathered together, an undigeſted, and formleſs lump of all Writers, good and bad, from which, he ſays, that Diſcretion being us'd, a Hiſtory might be form'd. And from theſe, the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, impatient of *Buchannan*'s ſeverity to *Luddus*, under the pretext of reſpect to *Epiſcopacy*, has drawn a new Model, without bringing new Materials, putting that confus'd Rabble in Rank and File, with ſome pleaſant Reflections.

SECT. 2. What Proofs we can adduce for our Hiſtory, and firſt of our Tradition.

I might then forbear to trouble my ſelf any further, than in anſwering thoſe few, and ill-founded Objections, muſter'd up by the Biſhop againſt us, which being remov'd, leave our Hiſtory in its former luſtre and ſplendor. But for ſerving my King and Country, and ſatisfying my Reader more entirely, I am reſolv'd to clear, that our Hiſtorians have proceeded upon ſufficient Warrants, according to the former uncontrovertible Propoſitions, which I at firſt laid down in relation to Hiſtory in general. And this I will endeavour to do, 1. By ſhewing

ing that our Tradition is very well founded. 2. By ſhewing, that we had ancient Annals, and that our Hiſtorians were Men of great Reputation, and that they founded their Hiſtories on thoſe ancient Annals. 3. That the beſt Hiſtorians among the *Britains*, do concur to aſſert our Antiquity; and that ſuch as oppoſe it, are Men of ſo little authority, as that their Teſtimony ſhould not be put in the Ballance with thoſe who ſtand for us. 4. That our Hiſtories are confirm'd by the authority of ancient Foreign Authors. 5. That our Hiſtories have been believ'd and applauded by the beſt of late *Hiſtorians*, *Critiques*, and *Antiquaries*, the beſt Judges in ſuch caſes. 6. That the antiquity of our Hiſtory is founded upon ſolid Reaſon, and great Probability as well as upon the Teſtimony of Authors, both within and without the Iſle: Which is all that can be done, or is requiſite for aſſerting and proving the Truth of any Hiſtory.

For clearing whereof I muſt inform my Reader, that whilſt this Iſle was Pagan, it had for its Prieſts, the

the *Druids*, who taught them Sciences, and Letters, and who were so famous, That * *Cæsar* tells us, That the *Gauls deriv'd their first Learning from them.* And all Histories acknowledg, That these us'd to transmit the Histories of their own times in Verses, which were taught by them to their Scholars: and it is probable, that some of these *Druids* having been converted from the *Pagan Religion*, whereof they were the Priests, became our first *Monks*; being thereto much inclin'd by the severity of their former Discipline: as the *Therapeutæ* did for the same Reason become the first *Anchorits* in *Egypt*; and so it was easie for them to inform the Monasteries of what they knew so well. And this Hint is confirm'd by a very clear passage in *Leslies* Preface to his History, who being a Bishop himself, should be believ'd by another of the same Character in a probable matter of Fact. Nor can there be a clearer Confirmation of our having had the *Druids* amongst us, than that in several places of the *Irish* Version of the *New Testament*, the *wise Men*, or *Priests*,

* *Disciplina in Britannia Reperta, atq; inde in Galliam translata esse existimatur:* Cæs. Bell. Gall. Lib. 6. *multa de ex eorum motu, de mundi ac terrarum magnitudine de rerum natura, de Deorum immortalium vi & potestate disputant & juventute tradunt. Ibid. Cum in publicis rationibus & privivatis, Græcis literis utantur.* Ibid. By *publicæ rationes*, are probably meant their Histories, at least it is most reasonable to think, that since they had the use of Letters, they would have written Histories, or some short Memorials.

Prieſts, are tranſlated *Druids*: and ſo, where the *Engliſh* Tranſlation ſaith, That *the Wiſe Men from the Eaſt came to worſhip our Saviour*: Our *Iriſh* Tranſlation has the *Druids*, &c. Our Predeceſſors alſo being deſcended from the *Spaniſh Gallicks*, or *Galicians*, as is acknowledg'd by Hiſtorians; and they having had the uſe of Letters, and of Grammar, long before this time, as * *Strabo* confeſſes, it cannot be imagined, but that we as a Colony of them, would have likewiſe a part of their Art and Learning. Our Predeceſſors alſo had their *Sanachies* and *Bards*; The firſt whereof were the Hiſtorians, and the latter the Poets of their Traditions, as *Luddus* himſelf acknowledges, and by either of theſe means, the Memory of our *Kings* and their Actions, might have been preſerv'd until the 5th Century; at which time we got Monaſteries; in which (as I ſhall hereafter prove) were written and preſerv'd the *Annals* of our Nation. And ſince nothing but great Improbabilities, and fundamental Inconſiſtencies, ſhould be allow'd to refute

* *Pag.* 96. *Edit. Caſaubon.*

a Hiſtory already receiv'd. I ſhall offer theſe Conſiderations for clearing, that this way of preſerving the Memory of our Kings, is as probable a mean as any can be in Hiſtory.

1. It is probable that our Nation, as all the reſt of Mankind, who are warlike, and in conſtant action, would be deſirous to preſerve the memory of thoſe Actions, for which they had hazarded their Lives, and by which they deſign'd to preſerve that Fame, which they preferr'd to Life it ſelf: And that the Kings likewiſe, whoſe Authority and Right was much reverenc'd for its Antiquity, would be as careful to preſerve thoſe Marks of their ancient Dominion.

2. We do not in this ſerious Debate, pretend to ſuch ancient Originations, and Deſcents, as might through Vanity tempt Men to lie, as thoſe do, who endeavour to derive themſelves from the *Trojans*. All that we pretend to in this Debate, being only, that we are a Colony, who probably came firſt from *Greece* to *Spain*, but ſettled

certain-

certainly in *Ireland* for ſome time: and that we came from them, after the time, in which *Cambden*, and *Uſher* acknowledge that the Nation of the *Scots* (whoſe Name we only now bear) were long ſettled there. Would not our Accuſers have us truſt the *Britiſh* Antiquities for 2500 years? and the *Iriſh* for a longer time than our own, without any written Hiſtory, or Manuſcript now extant before *Gilda's* time? And tho *Lycurgus* would not ſuffer his Laws to be written, yet they were preſerv'd in the Memories of Men, for more than 600 Years, as *Plutarch* obſerves; and we and other Nations have preſerv'd ſome Laws for much longer time, without the help of writing. And the only Points here controverted, being the firſt Settlement of our Nation, and that we continue Subjects to the ſame race of Kings; theſe are matters ſo remarkable, that moſt Nations know when ſuch Changes happened to one another. As for inſtance, tho there were no Hiſtory yet extant, we ſhould eaſily have known that the *Saxons*, *Danes*, and *Normans* conquer'd

quer'd the *Britons*, and alter'd the Race of their Kings. That *Ireland* had many little Monarchs, till they were ſwallow'd up by *Henry* the 2d of *England*. And that *Edward Bruce*, Brother to our glorious King *Robert* the firſt, was choſen King of *Ireland*, with univerſal Conſent there, and might have continued in that Government, if from too great a love to Fame, and to gain a Victory without his Brother, he had not loſt it, and himſelf. And though all theſe controverted Points, fell out in a time after the uſe of Letters was known to moſt Nations, and particularly to the *Druids* and *Romans*, the one whereof were our Prieſts, and the other our Neighbours very long, yet there remains not the leaſt veſtige of a doubt, that our Scepter was ever ſway'd by any other Race.

3. Though we had wanted the uſe of Letters, as moſt probably we did not; Yet the Tradition controverted, is at moſt of about 800 years. For, after that time, it ſhall be proved, that we had Records and Annals: And the things ſaid of our Kings, during that time, are ſo few,

and ſo remarkable, that Men might have taught the ſame to their Children in a weeks time: And Men lived ſo long at that time, that ten or twelve Men might have tranſmitted the Tradition to one another. *As* alſo, ſince private Families do preſerve to this day their Tradition for as long time as this; it was much more eaſy for a Nation, and their Kings, to preſerve theirs. Nor can I tell why my Lord *St. Aſaph*, in his Preface, can controvert our Tradition, though we could not produce Writers who lived in thoſe Times, wherein theſe *A*ctions are ſaid to be done: ſince * he thinks *it reaſonable to judge that there was the ſame Government here in* Britain, *though for want of Ancient Writings, there could be produced no plain Inſtances of it.* And if this be allowed to *Epiſcopacy* in theſe times, why ſhould he not have allow'd the ſame favour to his Monarch's Predeceſſors, in the ſame and more ancient Ages.

* Pag. 71.

4. It was much eaſier for us to preſerve our Traditions, than for the *Engliſh*, we being all deſcended from the ſame Race, and being ſtill the ſame

ſame People, living under the uninterrupted ſucceſſion of the ſame *Royal-Line*; Whereas they were oblig'd to ſuppreſs the Traditions and Memorials of the People whom they had conquer'd.

5. As no Man is preſum'd to lie, or cheat, without ſome great Temptation; ſo the moſt glorious things that are ſaid of us, are true beyond debate. As our having defended the Ground in which we ſetled, againſt all oppoſition to this very day: Our having put the firſt ſtop to the *Roman* Greatneſs; our having beat the far more numerous *Britans*, though defended by ſtrong Walls, and ſtronger *Romans*: All which cannot be deny'd to have been done by us, and are equally noble, whether we were ſetled here or not, when we did them. After thoſe controverted Times, it cannot be deny'd, that we carried our Conqueſts further into *Britain* than formerly: That we fought long with ſucceſs againſt the *Saxons* and *Picts*, and did at laſt extirpate the latter: And when we were alone, we continued, and extended our former Con-

queſts againſt the *Danes* and *Normans*; which proves alſo, that in the Wars which we had againſt the *Romans* in conjunction with the *Picts*, the Victories we then got, are chiefly to be aſcrib'd to us. And to crown all, we have generouſly contributed all that was in our power, to ſupport that Ancient and Royal Family (ſo unparallell'd for its antiquity) by which we were animated, and inſtructed to do all thoſe great Actions, till they are now become the Monarchs of the whole Iſle; having by a happier way extinguiſhed thoſe Wars and Animoſities, and may he be unhappy who revives them.

For clearing how this Tradition might have been, and was preſerv'd; Our Hiſtory tells us of a probable way among many others, which was, That at the Coronation of our Kings, one appeared and recited his whole Genealogy. I ſhall trouble my Reader only with a proof of this Cuſtom, which is ſuch as confirms alſo the Genealogy of King *Alexander* the 3*d*, in the year 1249, prior to *Fordon*'s time, or to the view of

of any ſuch Debate, and is related by *Fordon* and *Major* in the Life of that King; and being ſo memorable a Fact, and ſo near *Fordon's* own time, his Relation cannot but be credited. His words are, That *the King being plac'd in the Marble-Chair, the Crown upon his Head, and the Scepter in his Hand, and the Nobility being ſet below Him, a Venerable old High-landed Gentleman ſtept out, and bowing the Knee, expreſs'd himſelf to the King in the High-land Language thus*; *God bleſs you King* Alexander, *Son of* Alexander, *Son of* William, *&c.* And ſo carried up the Genealogy to *Fergus* the Firſt: Which Cuſtom was moſt ſolemnly us'd at the Coronation of King *Charles* the *Martyr*, at which time their Pictures were expos'd, and nobleſt Actions recited.

As alſo the reciting of their Genealogy was uſual at the Burial of ours Kings, a written Proof of which Tradition, is to be ſeen in a Manuſcript of *Baldredus Abbas Rynalis*; (for that which is the Abbacy of *Melros*, was ſo called before King *David's* time, who deſigns

them ſo in the Foundations of the Lands of *Melros*, which he gives to them) and is related *verbatim* by *Fordon*, conſiſting of eighteen Chapters, mentioning the memorable Actions of King *David*, upon whom the Lamentation is made, who died 1151; and running up the Genealogy of the ſaid St. *David* to *Fergus* the Firſt, dedicated to *Henry* Prince of *England*, Grand Nephew to St. *David*, who came to the Crown of *England*, *Anno* 1154, under the name of *Henry* the Second: In both which at leaſt *Fordon* is to be believ'd, having ſufficient Vouchers. This alſo being ordinary in our High-land Families to this very day, not only at Burials, but Baptiſms and Marriages: and in which Families, Men continue ſtill to be deſign'd from their Fathers, Grandfathers, and very many Generations upwards; as is a ſufficient Hiſtorical Proof of Tradition, tho we had no other Warrant for thoſe few Ages.

SECT. 3. Proofs from Manuſcripts and Records.

Before I come to clear that we had Manuſcripts and Records, it is fit to conſider that is very probable,

ble, that as the Hiſtory of moſt Nations was preſerv'd by their Prieſts and Church-men: ſo ours would be very ready to oblige the Kings, under whom, and the People among whom they liv'd, by writing their Annals. And therefore we may reaſonably conclude, that ſince we were very early Chriſtians, we had therefore ancient Hiſtories written by our Church-men, beſides thoſe which we may pretend to have been tranſmitted to them by the *Druids*. And the Biſhop himſelf acknowledges that the Monaſtery of *Hy*, call'd by us *Icolm-kill*, (that is *Hy*, the Cell of *Columba*) was founded about the year 560; and it is undeniable, that 48 of our old Kings were buried, and our Records were kept there ſince its Foundation, until the Reign of *Malcolm Canmore*: and it is alſo certain, that our Annals were written in our Monaſteries, ſuch as *Scoon*, *Pasley*, *Pluſcardin*, and *Lindesfern* * govern'd by three *Scotiſh Biſhops*, *Aidan*, *Finan*, and *Colman*; and *Abercorn*, mention'd by † *Beda*; and *Melroſs*, the Chronicle whereof begins where

* *Beda paſſim.*

† *Lib.4.cap.26.*

Beda ends, as their Hiſtory now printed ſhews: though certainly that *Engliſh* Manuſcript is very unfaithful, for moſt of the things relating to our Nation are omitted, as particularly about the beginning, in the year 844. Our Manuſcript obſerves (which the *Engliſh* has not) *That* Alpin *King of the* Scots *died, to whom ſucceeded his Son* Kenneth, *who beat the Picts, and was declared firſt King of all* Scotland, *to the Water of* Tine; and after it expreſſes in his Epitaph,

Primus in Albania fertur Regnaſſe Kenedhus
Filius Alpini, prælia multa gerens.

And it obſerves that *he was called the firſt King of* Albany, *not becauſe he was the firſt who made the Scotiſh Laws, but becauſe he was the firſt King of all* Scotland. And each of our Monaſteries had two Books, the one call'd their *Regiſter*, or *Chartulary*, containing the Records relating to their private ſecurities; and another call'd their *Black-book*, containing an account of the memorable

rable things which occur'd in every Year. And as it is ſtrongly preſumable, that our Hiſtorians would have compil'd our Hiſtories from thoſe: So this being a matter of Fact, is probable by Witneſſes: and I thus prove it in ſuch a way and manner as is ſufficient to maintain any Hiſtory. *Verimundus* a *Spaniard*, *Arch-deacon* of St. *Andrews*, in *Anno* 1076, (as is remarked by * *Chambers* of *Ormond*) declares in the Epiſtle to his Book of the Hiſtorians of *Scotland*, dedicated to King *Malcolm*, call'd *Can-more*; That, *albeit there are many things in the ſaid Hiſtories, which may ſeem to the Readers to be a little difficult to be believed, becauſe they are not totally confirmed by Foreign Hiſtorians: Yet after have they heard how the* Scots *were ſetled in the North Part of the Iſle of* Albion, *ſeparated by the Sea from the firm Land, and ſo ſeldom troubled by Strangers, to whom they give no occaſions to write their Actions; and alſo that they have not been leſs happy in having almoſt always among them the* Druids, *Religious People, and diligent Chroniclers, before the Reception of*

* Pag. 229.

of the Christian Faith, *and continually since* Monks, *faithful Historians in the Isles of* Man, *and* Icomkill; *where they kept securely their Monuments and Antiquities, without giving a sight, or Copy of them to strangers; they will cease to wonder.* This *Chambers* was a Learned Man, and a Lord of Session, who wrote *anno* 1572, and in his * Preface, says, That *he had those principal Authors,* Verimund *a Spaniard,* Turgot *Bishop of St.* Andrews, John Swenton, John Campbel, *and Bishop* Elphinstoun, *&c. and many great Histories of the Abbacies of* Scoon, *called the Black-book, and of other like Chronicles of Abbacies, as that of* Inch-colm, *and* Icolmkill, *the most part whereof he took pains to consider as much as was possible for him.* He * cites *Verimund* for an account of the *Scots* and *Picts*, and after he also † cites him for the Miracle of St. *Andrews* in *Hungus*'s time; and he * gives an account of the tenor of the League betwixt *Charles the Great*, and *Achaius*, and asserts *that the same was extracted out of the Registers and Books he mention'd*, and particularly, *out of the second Book of* Verimund.

* Pag. 13.

* Pag. 24.

† Pag. 94.

* Pag. 95, & 96.

Sir

Sir *Richard Baker* cites this *Verimund*, among the Authors out of whom he compiled his Hiſtory; and with him he cites *Joannes Gampbellus*, who (he ſays) wrote the Hiſtory of the *Scots* from the Origine of the Nation till the Year 1260, in which he liv'd: And alſo *Turgot*, who (he ſays) wrote our Annals from the beginning till the Year 1098, in which he liv'd, (and him likewiſe *Hollinshed* cites); as alſo *Aluredus Rivallenſis*, who wrote the Hiſtory of King *David*, and died *Anno* 1166; and *Bartholomeus Anglicus*, who wrote a Chronicle of the *Scots*, and liv'd in the Year 1360. Two of which three laſt, we have reaſon to think were *Scots-men*, and have been called *Engliſh-men*, only becauſe they liv'd in the Counties which now belong to *England*, but then certainly belong'd to us; and if they be *Engliſh-men*, they are yet the more credible Witneſſes for us. And as the worthy *Baker* ſays, he compil'd his Hiſtory out of theſe Books, which he neither would nor could have ſaid, if he had not ſeen them: So it is very probable that he did ſee them; our Records

and

and Manuſcripts having been induſtriouſly carry'd to *England* by *Edward* the Firſt, as ſhall be hereafter obſerv'd: Nor can it be anſwer'd, that he cited them at ſecond-hand from *Boeth*, or *Buchannan*, for elſe he had cited the other Authors whom they cite, ſuch as *Richardus de ſancto victore*, *Fordon*, *Major*, &c. All this doth evidently demonſtrate that we had ſuch Hiſtorians as *Verimund*, and the others above-cited, who aſſerted before *Fordon* what he has related: ſo that it was moſt unwarrantable to ſay, that theſe things were dream'd by *Fordon* and *Boethius*, but that *Verimund* was ſeen and conſider'd by others, and cited in a particular part of his Book, which could not be copied from *Boethius*, becauſe he doth not cite *Verimund* for all thoſe Tranſactions; and upon this * *Balæus*, a Learn'd *English-man*, hath reſted. And † *Holinshed* ſays, that *Verimund* wrote a Book, *De Regibus Scotorum*. Nor can it be deny'd that *Geſner* in *verbo Verimund*, and other famous Strangers, cite him as one who has written our Hiſtory *ab exordio Scoticæ gentis, uſque ad Malcolmi*

* Part Poſt.

† Pag. 100, & pag. 460.

colmi tempora. And it is incredible to think ſo good and grave a Man as *Boetius* could have been ſo impudent to aſſert in *his Dedication to King *James* the 5th, *That theſe Books were ſent to him by the Earl of* Argile, *and his Brother the Theſaurer from* Icolmkill, and that, *he had follow'd them in writing his Hiſtory:* Eſpecially ſince he is by *Eraſmus* that great *Critick, admir'd as a moſt Learned Man, they having ſtudied together at* Paris, *where he remembers that he was in great eſteem.* And in a Letter concerning him, *Anno* 1530, inſerted in the Life of *Eraſmuus*, he remarks, that *Boethius was a Perſon who could not lie.* How can it then be imagined, that he would have adventur'd to have printed a whole *Romance*, and have told his King and the World, that he had the Manuſcripts by him? Nor is this aſſerted only by *Boethius*, and our own Hiſtorians, but by *Paulus Jovius*, a very famous Foreign Hiſtorian, who in his Deſcription of *Scotland*, ſays, * That *in Jona*

* Et Lib. 7.

* *Aſſervantur in arcanis templi armariis vetuſtiſſimorum Annalium Codices atq; item latæ membranæ, ipſorum Regum ſubſcriptæ manibus aureiſq; vel cereis ſigillorum imaginibus obſignatæ; quibus antiquæ leges edictaq; & finium ac Civitatum Jura publica continentur.*

(which

(which we call *Icolmkill*) *are kept the ancient Annals and Manuſcripts in hidden Preſſes of the Church, and large Parchments aſigned by the King's own hands, and ſeal'd either with Seals of Gold, or Wax.* By which alſo it appears how nice we have been in ſecuring the Faith of our Hiſtory, the Seals of our Kings being put to what was written by our devout Church-men. And whereas the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, to leſſen the Credit of *Boethius* *, relates, that *Bishop Gavin Dowglas adviſed* Polidor Virgil *not to follow his Hiſtory.* *Polidor Virgil* himſelf is appeal'd to, where there is no mention of *Boethius* at all, nor could it be; for *Polidor* regrates that *Gavin Dowglas* died *Anno* 1520, whereas *Boethius* was not publiſh'd till 1526, and † *Boethius* himſelf informs us, That *the Records from which he form'd his Hiſtory, were ſent him from* Icolmkill *Anno* 1525, *and no ſooner*; neither did he ſee thoſe Warrants from which he wrote his Hiſtory, till that Year. And it appears by that paſſage, that *Gavin Dowglas* believ'd our account, and produc'd a Manuſcript

* *Pag.* 38. *Pref.*

† *Lib.* 7.

ſcript for it, which I now cite, and uſe as an acceſſory Argument, and prove it by the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, and *Polidor*: and whereas the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* pretends that the *Relation given by* Gavin Dowglas *agreed with* Nennius, *but contradicted Boethius*; the contrary is probable by *Polidor*'s own Relation of what *Gavin Dowglas* writ to him, which agrees with *Boethius* in every thing relating to our Antiquity. The Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* is alſo moſt unjuſt to *Boethius*, in alledging that Voſſius *conſiders him as a fabulous Author*: For *Voſſius* commends him from what *Eraſmus* and *Buchannan* ſay of him, and in the end taxes him only a little *for having believ'd too many Miracles*, a fault incident to moſt *Popiſh Writers* in thoſe times, but to none more than to the Biſhop's own obſcure Authors, for which, among many other Teſtimonies, I refer my Reader to them who writ the Preface to the Hiſtories of *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter*, and to *the Life of King* Alfred, and *Walſingham*'s Hiſtory. It can alſo be proved by many famous Gentlemen,

that

that the *Black Book of Scoon*, containing our Hiſtories from the beginning, was among *Preſident Spotwood*'s Books, and was given by *Lewis Cant* to *Major General Lambert*, and by him to *Collonel Fairfax*; which Book King *Charles* the firſt had ranſom'd from *Rome* by a conſiderable Sum of Money. And it is certain that *Spotſwood* had it, and the *Black Book* of *Paſley*, ſigned by the hands of three Abbots, when he compil'd his Hiſtory: Which Book of *Paſley*, together with the famous Book of *Pluſcardin*, *Buchanan* ſays he had, and frequently cites: and that there were ſuch Books is known to the whole Nation. And I my ſelf have ſeen in the Learned Sir *Robert Sibbald*'s Library (to whom this Nation owes very much) a very old Abridgment of the Book of *Paſley* (which Book Bp *Uſher* himſelf alſo cites) agreeing in every thing with our Hiſtories, and which was extracted *per venerabilem virum Joannem Gibſon Canonicum Glaſguenſem, & Rectorem de Renfrew, Anno* 1501. And two other old Manuſcripts, the one called,

called, *Excerpta de Chronicis Scotiæ, & Scoti-chronico*, which comes to the Reign of King *James* the 2*d*. and belong'd to Doctor *Arbuthnot* Physician to King *James* the 5*th*; and this proves that there were *Chronica* different from *Fordon's*. And the other, *Extracta de Regiſtro privatus Sancti-Andreæ*, giving the *Iriſh* Names of our Kings. As alſo I have ſeen a Manuſcript written by a Brother of the *minores Obſervants* of *Jedburgh*, in *Anno* 1533, containing an Abridgment of our Hiſtory, and whereof Doctor *Sibbald* has another Copy. And there is another old Manuſcript written by *Ventonius* yet extant, which *Buchanan* alſo cites, and follows.

Since the Writing of theſe Sheets, I have ſeen a very old Manuſcript brought from *Icolmkill*, written by *Carbre Liſachair*, who liv'd ſix Centuries before St. *Patrick*, and ſo about our *Saviours time*; wherein is given a full account of the *Iriſh* Kings: By which I conclude, that ſince the *Iriſh* had Manuſcripts then, certainly we muſt alſo be allowed to have had them, having greater oc-

caſion of learning Sciences, and writing Hiſtories; becauſe of our Commerce with the *Romans*, and polite *Britans*. In this Book alſo there are many Additions by the *Druids* of thoſe times: from which I likewiſe may confirm that the Prieſts in our old Monaſteries learn'd our Ancient Hiſtory from the *Druids* who preceded them.

I have ſeen alſo an old Genealogy of the Kings of the *Albanian Scots*, agreeing with that mentioned in our Hiſtory at the Coronation of King *Alexander* the 2d, and which has ſtill been preſerv'd as Sacred there.

I have alſo ſeen another old Manuſcript, wherein the *Dalreudini Albanach* are conſidered as ſetled here ſix Generations before *Eric*, whom *Uſher* calls the *Father of our Kings*. I find alſo in it, that *Angus Tuerteampher* reign'd in *Ireland* five Generations before our *Fergus* the Firſt; and that in his time the *Iriſh* and *Albanians* divided, and ſeparated from one another. Which agrees with our Hiſtories, which ſay, that the *Scots* were in this Country long before King *Fergus* and his Race ſetled here.

And

And theſe our Iriſh Manuſcripts agree in every thing with the abovecited Hiſtory of *Corbre'*, and are in effect Additions to his Book by our old *Sanachies*.

Having thus cleared, that there were ſufficient Warrants upon which our Authors might have founded their Hiſtories; I ſhall in the next place ſay ſomething of our Hiſtorians, and make appear that they deſerv'd the credit and applauſe they met with, and that they founded their Hiſtory on thoſe good Warrants, from which *Verimund*, *Boetius*, and *Chambers* are formerly prov'd to have drawn theirs, *viz.* our ancient Annals and Regiſters.

Fordon was no Monk, as the * Biſhop is pleas'd to call him, and we had no ſuch Monaſtery as *Fordon*: but he was *venerabilis vir dominus Johannes Fordon Presbyter*, and is called a *Monk* by the Biſhop (who ſtudies ſtill his own conveniency) to make the World believe he was inclin'd to lie, as the *Monks* are ſaid to have been in that Age; and to ſhew him intereſted for the Independency of *Monks* and *Culdees* from *Biſhops*.

* Pag. 26. Pref.

This Author began at leaſt to write before the Year 1341; for, in his Book he ſpeaks of that as a preſent Year. This Book was ſo eſteem'd, that there were Copies of it in moſt of our Monaſteries, and one of them we have in very old, but in fair Characters, continued by *Arelat*; another continued by a Reverend Man, *Walter Bowmaker*, Abbot of *Icolmkill*, and found in the cuſtody of one, who had preſerv'd ſeveral of the Manuſcripts of that Monaſtery: And both theſe Continuations have drawn out our Hiſtories to the Reign of King *James* the 2d. And it is not to be imagin'd that the Monaſteries would have eſteem'd it ſo much; or that the Abbot of that Monaſtery, where our chief Annals were kept, would have continued it, if they and he had not known it to agree with their Annals. And *Fordon* cites frequently through his Book *Chronica, & alia Chronica*, and *Beda*, and follows him exactly: he cites alſo *Adamnanus*, who liv'd before the Year 700; and *Turgot* Archbiſhop of St. *Andrews*, who lived *anno* 1098, and *Alvared*, (who dedicated his Book to King

King *Malcom* the 3d, about the year 1057.) He cites alſo other foreign Authors, ſuch as *Sigisbert*, and *Iſidor*, and ſo has done all that the Biſhop requires, and all that the beſt Hiſtorians can do: Neither does he follow *Jeffrey*, but contradicts him, even in the inſtance of *Baſſianus*, as ſhall be cleared to conviction, in anſwering the Biſhop's Objections. He has in him alſo *Baldredus* or *Ethelredus*, and the Proceſs before the Pope, containing the Copies of the authentick Letters, Objections, Apologies, and Anſwers made and ſign'd by *Edward* 1. and his Parliament, and the *Scotiſh Nobility*, produc'd before the Pope, about the year 1300, whereof the Copies are not only extant from *Fordon*, but the Biſhop alſo inſinuates that the Originals themſelves are extant in *England*, and certainly they were at *Rome*. And *Fordon* cites many other conſiderable old Records: He writes in a good Stile, and with good Judgment: and the reaſon why this Work was not printed, was not becauſe it deſerv'd not the Preſs, but becauſe *Boethius*, *Buchannan*, and

Lesly having printed their Hiſtories in their own time, and there being no printing in his, it was thought we had Hiſtories enow; which alſo occaſion'd the periſhing of many of our excellent Manuſcripts. But why ſhould the Biſhop object to us *Fordon* his not being printed, ſince he cites againſt us Manuſcripts never cited by any, and which have been left unprinted in a Country where every thing is printed: and I dare ſay, after exact peruſal of the Biſhops Book, and of the Authors cited by him, that *Fordon* is preferable to all thoſe old Legends, and moſt of thoſe Authors which he cites againſt us, venerable *Beda* only excepted, who is ſtill on our ſide.

Joannes Major was Rector of the famous Divinity-School of *Paris*, and was a Man of ſuch Reputation in that Univerſity, as that he is yet remembred with eſteem, and a Man of too innocent a life, to have written a Romance for a Hiſtory; and he likewiſe relates to *Beda*, and our Annals. Of *John Major* a full account and Elogium is given by the Learn'd *Launoy Academiæ Pariſienſis illuſtrata*, *Tom.*

Tom. 2. *pag.* 652, 653. *& ſequent.*

One of the moſt accurate Writers in this Age* ſays, That *the talent of writing Hiſtory hath not been found on this ſide of the Alps in any, ſave in* Buchannan, *who hath written the Hiſtory of* Scotland, *better than* Livius *did that of* Rome. The Biſhop of *Condom* alſo, and the famous *Rapin*, in their exact Eſſays concerning Hiſtory, have preferr'd none to him, ſave *Mariana* the Jeſuit, whom all Men know to be far inferior; but they prefer *Mariana*, becauſe *Buchannan* was a Proteſtant. *Joſeph Scaliger* ſays of *Buchannan* and Us,

* Vicfort memoirs des Ambaſſadeurs.

Imperii fuerat Romani Scotia *limes*,
Romani *Eloquii*, Scotia *finis erit.*

And * Mr. *Dryden* alſo my Friend, whom I eſteem a great Critick, as well as Poet, prefers *Buchannan* to all the Hiſtorians that ever wrote in *Britain*. And tho I approve as little of *Buchannan*'s Politicks as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* doth, yet I will not be ſo unjuſt to him as he is, * in ſaying, That *Buchannan* in the

* Pref. new Tranſlat. of *Plutarch*'s Lives.

* Pag. 30. Pref.

Life of *Fergus* the First, refers to our old Annals, but he cites them not; for there is no such thing in the Life of that King: And he was not so much a favourer of Monarchy, to have allow'd it the advantage of so singular an Antiquity, if he had not found the same due to it, from our Manuscripts and Records, beyond all contradiction.

Bishop *Lesly*, and Arch-bishop *Spotswood* are Men who have written our History with great judgment and truth, and it cannot be imagin'd that they who were indeed banish'd for Loyalty, and suffer'd the loss of all for their Persuasion, would have asserted a whole bundle of Lies, or a continued Romance, as the Author calls our History, especially since they had both seen *Luddus*, and knew that their History would be enquired into. And* *Lesly* has the confidence to tell in his Preface to the Nobility, That *his History had been drawn with all the exactness that the truth of Hi-*

* *In quibus scribendis ne Historia lex violaretur, illæ quæ prius scripta sunt, non solum exegimus ad veritatem annalium, quæ in publico Regni nostri archivo, aliisque antiquissimis codicibus quos majores nostri Pasleti, Sconæ, ac in aliis Monasteriis religiose servarunt, continebantur.* Lesl. præm. ad nobil. populumque Scot. Pag. 29.

story

ſtory requires from the ancient Records of the Kingdom, and the Monaſteries, and he was then at *Rome*, whither they were carried. It is alſo very pleaſant to hear the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* inveigh againſt *Dempſter* the Jeſuit, one of our Antiquaries, whoſe Book certainly he had never ſeen, elſe he would never have call'd him a Jeſuit as he * does. For the very Title of his Book bears that he was *Baro de Muiresk*, and a Lawyer, and he was indeed *Profeſſor honorarius* of the Civil Law at *Bologna* in *Italy*, and died married, as the Hiſtory of his Life, writ by *Peteraces*, bears: and we may know by the Elogies of the greateſt Wits in *Italy*, how much they eſteem'd him for his extraordinary Learning, and Parts. I may add to theſe, *David Camerarius de fortitudine*, &c. *Scotorum*, beſides *Richardus de ſancto victore*, and *Cornelius Hibernicus*, both which wrote our ancient Hiſtories, the laſt of them liv'd in the year 1140. And they are both follow'd by *Boethius*, and cited by *Voſſius*, *Baleus*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, and others; and alſo *Adamnanus*

* Pag. 153.

nanus that wrote St. *Columba*'s Life.

From all which it appears, that our Hiſtorians have been Men of great credit and eſteem, and have founded their Hiſtory upon more authentick Documents, than almoſt any other Hiſtorians in the World, *viz.* the Records of many Monaſteries in the time when Monaſteries were very devout, and upon the univerſal Tradition of the times, both ancient and modern; and that before there was any competition or controverſie concerning our Antiquity; and that what they have ſaid, has been univerſally believ'd by all the learned World. To which I ſhall add that our Clerk of Regiſters, *Skeen*, the great Antiquary, had added from thoſe ancient Records a Chronology of our Kings, and which he has inſerted amongſt our Acts of Parliament. Is not then the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* much to blame, when he would have all this paſs for a Romance, and all thoſe Authors to be reputed only as one? Becauſe, as he ſays, they followed one another from *Fordon*, and he follow'd *Jeffrey*; neither of which is ſo. Tho I confeſs the contri-

trivance of this untruth was prety, but happily disappointed, by their asserting that they founded their Histories upon the old Records of our Monasteries, and on *Turgot*, *Verimund*, and others; all which they had seen, and who are elder than *Fordon*. And it might be as well objected against Witnesses, that they came in and depos'd one after another, giving for the reason of their knowledg, that they had seen what they depos'd.

If all these Manuscripts, which I have cited were extant, I doubt not but the Author himself would acknowledg our Histories to be instructed beyond debate; and therefore if I can instruct them to have once been, they must be reputed as good as extant still. For both Law, and common Reason having consider'd that Papers are very subject to be lost, and to perish; have therefore allow'd, that if it can be prov'd, that there were such Papers, and that they were lost by accident, that this probation shall supply the loss. And I desire to know if the Warrants of Dr. *Burnet*'s History of the

the Reformation had been burnt, would not the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* have been angry, if his Teſtimony and Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s had not been ſufficient to prove the tenor of them? And what have we for many Authors, whom *Livy*, *Joſephus*, and *Herodot* cite beſides their own Teſtimony? And what probation did ever Mankind ſee ſtronger, than that which we adduce in this caſe? For firſt, that all our Monaſteries did write our Annals, is beſide common Fame, and univerſal and late Tradition, which paſſes over all our Country, prov'd by the other Authorities above cited: If then two ordinary Witneſſes be ſufficient to prove a matter of Fact, we muſt much more allow, that this matter may be prov'd by very many Perſons, conſiderable for their Devotion and Quality. 2. There are other Manuſcripts yet extant, ſome whereof I my ſelf have ſeen, and have formerly nam'd, all agreeing with the tenour of our Hiſtory, and long prior to *Luddus*'s ſtarting of this Debate, in *Anno* 1572. And ſo muſt prove ſufficient to ſupport

our

our Hiſtories, and thoſe Witneſſes; eſpecially ſeeing they have nothing in them contrary to Reaſon, or other credible Hiſtories; but on the contrary, are ſupported by both, and written by Authors of great Integrity and Knowledg, and have been receiv'd with great applauſe in the World, and are alſo confirm'd by the *Engliſh* Hiſtorians themſelves. And therefore I muſt conclude with the Learned *Voſſius*, * *That albeit the old Monuments of* Rome *periſht, that therefore the Faith of their Hiſtory ſhould not periſh with them.*

* De Hiſt. Lat. pag. 4.

Leſt it might be thought that we our ſelves caus'd to deſtroy thoſe Records we now cite, to prevent further inquiry, and to ſhew how much harder it is for us than other Nations, to be call'd to ſuch an account: I ſhall deſire Strangers to be inform'd as a *caſus omiſſionis*, that our ancient Records were deſtroyed in three remarkable occaſions; 1. When *Edward* the Firſt took away all our Records that he could find, having, as all Hiſtorians declare, reſolv'd to aboliſh all memory of our Nation: and of which we accus'd

accus'd him before the Pope, and he did not deny it. 2. When our Monks flying to *Rome* at the Reformation, carry'd with them their Records. 3. By *Cromwel*, who carry'd our Records into *England*, and many of which were loſt at Sea in their return.

SECT. 4.

The other Hiſtorians of this Iſle cited againſt us, examined.

But if our Hiſtorians are to be rejected, I hope it muſt be by the Authority of far more, and far more credible Authors, agreeable to a Principle of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s, the Patron of our Biſhop's Book, who * ſays, *Certainly they who undertake to contradict that which is received by common Conſent, muſt bring ſtronger and clearer Evidence, than that on which that Conſent is grounded, or elſe their Exceptions ought to be rejected with the higheſt Indignation.* Which Principle, as it ſeems to be recommended by Reaſon, ſo it is founded upon the expreſs Law of all Nations; by which it is acknowledg'd, that the Teſtimonies of Witneſſes are not to be reprobated but by others in a double number, and who are of far greater Authority. And from

* Orig. Sac. p. 114. Sect. 5.

from this Principle it is, that if a Jury of fifteen hath absolv'd a Man unjustly, though that Jury consisted of the meanest Men of the Nation, yet their Verdict cannot be question'd for error, otherways than by twenty five, whereof most part must be Persons of Quality, who must proceed upon most infallible grounds and evidences. By this rule then, our Historians cannot be redargu'd, otherways than by the Testimonies of far more unsuspected Historians, who agree in what they assert against us, and who are receiv'd with greater applause in the World than ours, and proceed upon far stronger Evidences. Let us then examine if these Qualifications can be found in those Historians, by whom the faith of ours is to be overturned. And first, as to the old *British* Historians, it might be objected by us, that they are too much interested, both because the Subject Matter is an emulation for Antiquity between the two Nations, and because they were over-run by our Countrymen at that time to a degree to make them passionate enough for disabling

a Witneſs: And as it is very remarkable that *Florentius Wigorienſis*, *Malmesburienſis*, *Huntingdonenſis*, and *Hoveden* wrote about the Reign of *Henry* the Second; and *Tho. Walſingham*, and *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter*, in the Reigns of *Edward* the Third, and *Henry* the Sixth; at all which times there were Wars and Animoſities betwixt the Nations. So if any Man will read the ſad Lamentations that are in *Gilda's*, and the rage with which he cries out againſt us, no Man can allow him to be an unſuſpected Judg or Witneſs in what concerns our Honour. *Polidor Virgil* ſuſpects, * *that there are ſome things ſuppoſititious in the Hiſtory of Gildas*; and if any thing, certainly we may ſuſpect moſt what is added concerning us; ſince the deſign of detracting from our Hiſtory, poſſeſt too much thoſe who were Maſters of that Manuſcript, and printed the ſame. And yet *Gildas* ſays very little that can be wreſted againſt us in the Points controverted; being, as *Beda* interprets him, clearly for us, as ſhall hereafter appear. 2. As our Writers are not

* Pag. 16.

infe-

inferiour in number, ſo moſt of theirs deſerve no credit, and they agree not ſo well againſt us in the Points controverted, as our Authors do in what they aſſert, *viz. when we ſetled here*, and who were *our firſt Kings*: For * *Nennius Britannus* does poſitively ſay, *that the* Scots *came here in the time of* Brutus. *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* ſays, that *we ſetled here the eleventh year after Chriſt.* And *Baker* * acknowledgeth that *Severus* built his Wall againſt the *Scots* and *Picts*, without mentioning this to be the firſt incurſion; and this at leaſt confutes the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, who aſſerts that we were not come to this Iſle even by way of incurſion, till after the year 300. As they thus differ remarkably as to our Origination, and moſt of them follow *Jeffreys* ridiculous Inventions, as our Author himſelf acknowledges: So * *Holinſhed*, ſpeaking of thoſe ancient times, ſays, *That* Scotland *had in thoſe days two Kingdoms, the one whereof conſiſted of the* Picts, *called* Pictland; *and the other of the* Iriſh *Race, call'd* Scotland: *which I hope* (ſays he) *no wiſe Man will readily deny.* And

* Cap. 3. as cited by S. *Aſaph*, pag. 14. Pref.

* Pag. 2.

* Pag. 16.

Caixton in his old Chronicle of *England*, tells, that *the King of the* Scots *assisted* Cassibelan *King of the* Britains *against* Julius Cæsar: which shews that our Antiquity was believed. And *Balæus*, a most famous *English* Chronologist, says, that * *the* Scots *wrote*, &c. *ex incorrupta annalium Fide*. 3. That our settlement was so ancient, as not only to have been contemporary with their Historians, but even to be higher than their Chronology could reach to, appears from this, that *Gildas* declares † *he knew nothing of us, but what he was forc'd to borrow from beyond Sea.* * Beda *places us amongst the old Inhabitants of this Isle*, without condescending upon the particular time, which he had given us, if he had known it himself, as he did in all other occasions. *Nennius* their next Author to *Beda* owns, *that the most skillful amongst the* Scots, *affirm'd in his time, that we were descended from* Scota, as our Authors now do. * And the eldest after him affirm, that *we are descended from* Albanactus, *second Sond to* Brutus. And this is so far acknowledg'd by succeeding Ages,

* Bal. Pref. part post.

† De excid. Brit.

* Cap. 1. Beda.

* St. *Asaph*, p. 10.

Ages, that *Edward* the First *did upon that account claim the ſuperiority to* England *over us, as younger Brother to* Locrinus *the eldeſt Son of* Brutus. And we may ſee in *Hollinſhed*, * *where he brings in many* Scotiſh *Kings doing Homage to the Kings of* Britain, *long before this year* 502, and in which ſeveral of their Authors agree with him. And the Biſhop fore-ſeeing the unanſwerable ſtrength of this Argument, acknowledges *this Superiority to be a moſt unjuſt Pretenſion*, as indeed it is; eſpecially ſeeing it is undeniable, that there was any ſuch thing known in the World then, as that *Feudol Homage* which the *Engliſh* Hiſtorians contend for; there being no Veſtige thereof in any part of *Europe*, till the 800 year of God, and we having had no ſuch Kings as ſome of thoſe whom they name in that ancient Homage. But yet even all theſe Forgeries prove clearly, that we were conſider'd by thoſe Writers, as Inhabitants here paſt all Memory, and as ancient as themſelves. * *Giraldus Cambrenſis* alſo conſiders us *as deſcended from* Gathelus *and* Scota,

* Lib. 2. Deſcript. Britan. cap. 8. & 9.

* Girald. Camb. Diſtinct. 3. cap. 7.

which proves not only that this old Tradition was believ'd, but that *Fordon* was not the inventer of it. For *Girald* liv'd about 200 years before *Fordon*. But how any Hiſtorian in this alſo can controvert this Antiquity after *Selden* has aſſerted it, *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. I underſtand not. There is likewiſe a very full and well written Manuſcript in the hands of the Lord *Maitland*, which makes us *to come from* Spain, *about the year of the World* 3242, *and to have been firſt govern'd by Captains, and thereafter govern'd by the Kings mention'd in our Hiſtory*. 4. There are no poſitive Authorities produc'd againſt us, condeſcending expreſly when our *Royal Line* did begin, ſave three *Legendary Stories* written with deſign, in whom no Proteſtant Biſhop can find any conſiderable Paſſages worthy to be cited; the eaſieſt thing in them being, * *That a Child made a Fire of Ice*; † and that when St. *Columba* was ſick, his Mare wept.

* Vita St. *Pat.* Cap. 5.

† *Vita Columb. Adamn. lib.* 3. *c.* 16.

The firſt is a nameleſs Author of St. *Patrick*'s Life, cited by * *Uſſher*, who affirms, that when *Neil Neilialagh was King of* Ireland, and *Conſtan-*

* De Eccl. Brit. primord. p. 587.

ſtantius was Emperor, Muredus *King of* Ulſter *had ſix Sons, who poſſeſt themſelves of the Northern Parts of* Britain, *and the Nation ſprung from them* (as *Giraldus* repeating this paſſage, ſays) *was by a ſpecial name called* Scotland. *And it may be*, ſaith the Biſhop, *Reuda* mention'd by *Beda, was one of theſe ſix Sons.* Joceline, another Author of St. *Patrick's* Life, tells, that *the twelve Sons of the King of* Dalrieda *in* Ireland, *having deſpiſed their youngeſt Brother* Fergus, *he complain'd of them to St.* Patrick, *and he propheſied to him, that from him ſhould deſcend Kings, who ſhould reign in many Foreign Kingdoms; and accordingly* Fergus *became King of all* Dalrieda, *and after his Succeſſors had for many Generations reigned there*, Aidanus *the Son of* Gabranus *conquer'd* Albania, *now call'd* Scotland, *and the other Iſles, in which his Poſterity by due Succeſſion reign to this day. But an elder Author cited by* Cambden (*and whom* * Uſher calls the *writer of the* Tigernack *Annals*) *brings the* Scotiſh *Kings from another Origine, to which* Uſher *himſelf is inclin'd.* Fergus (ſays that

* Cap. 137.

* Pag. 160.

Author) *the Son of* Eric, *was the first of the offspring of* Chonar, *who obtain'd the Kingdom of* Albania *from* Brown-Albain, to the *Irish Sea* and *Inchgall*, whom he places *Anno* 503, *and from him the Kings of* Fergus's *race reign'd in* Brun-Albain, *or* Brun-heir *to* Alphin *the Son of* Eochal, *and with this* (as the Bishop says) *the* Irish *Genealogies agree.* And thus our approv'd History must be overturn'd by Legends, and Genealogies.

Upon which passages I beg leave to make these few Reflections. First, that (besides, that these Authors liv'd not within 600 years of the times of which they wrote (which the Bishop of St. *Asaph* objects to ours) they do also contradict not only our Story, but the *Roman*, who place us here much sooner). All these three Authors contradict one another in the most remarkable part of our History, and in so late a matter of Fact, as that of *Fergus* the Second, which shews them neither faithful nor learn'd Chronologists. The first nameless Author, writer of the Life of S. *Patrick*, makes

our

our King to have been one of the Sons of Mured, whom *Uſher* conjectures to have been *Reuther*, and he muſt have liv'd in 360; for *Conſtantius* reign'd then, and *Mured*'s Son liv'd in his Reign. *Jocelin* makes *Aidan* to be the firſt, and to have ſprung from *Fergus* after many Generations: And this agrees well with ours, but not with the other Writers of St. *Patrick*'s Life. For we place the beginning of *Aidan*'s Reign in 570, and it could be no ſooner, according to *Jocelin*. The third is the Author of the *Tigernack Annals*, or an ancienter Writer cited by *Cambden*, who places our firſt King in 503, and there he is call'd *Fergus*; and ſo they neither agree in the name of our firſt King, nor in the time of their entry to this Kingdom. Which dreaming Glances have riſen from an imperfect notion of our Hiſtory, the firſt having borrowed his from *Beda*, who brings us here *ſub duce Reuda*: the ſecond has been invented to fulfil the Prophecy of St. *Patrick*, who promis'd the Kingdom not to *Fergus* himſelf, but to one of his Succeſſion, and

therefore finding none of our Kings nam'd in *Beda*, ſave *Reuther* and *Aidan*; he fixes on *Aidan* as the lateſt. And the third of theſe, finding that *Fergus* was uncontrovertedly the name of our firſt King, will rather contradict the reſt, and go back from *Aidan* to *Fergus*. And thus they cleuſh here, making the the firſt *Fergus* the ſecond, as they do elſewhere, in making *Scotia* to be *Ireland*, or *Scotia major*.

2. Since the Biſhop's Authors are ſo irreconcileable, what Warrants can he or they have to contradict our poſitive Hiſtory? * And Biſhop *Uſher* cites another Author of St. *Patrick*'s Life, *Meyerus*, who tells us that *after St.* Patrick's *Voyage about this Iſle, he turn'd his Boat to an Isle which bears to this day the name of St.* Patrick; out of which Iſle I believe the Accuſers of our Hiſtorians got their beſt Intelligence.

* De Primord. pag. 611.

3. That this *Reuda* could not be one of *Mureda*'s ſix Sons, is moſt clear, both becauſe *Beda* ſpeaks of the *Scots* coming to this Iſle, as very ancient, even in his time, which could not be if this had happen'd in

in *Anno* 360; for *Beda* liv'd in *Anno* 730, and how can it be imagin'd that *Beda* could not have known the whole Series of a Royal Deſcent that was ſo recent. Nor do our Hiſtorians, whoſe Faith is not controverted, after *Fergus* the Second, mention any *Reuda* after his Reign: and ſo he behov'd to be an elder King, and conſequently we had King's before *Fergus* the Second, which the Authors denies. Nor could any of theſe Sons of *Mured* have been *Fergus* the Second, whom theſe late Inventors call our firſt King; for no Author makes *Fergus* the Second to have reign'd within more than 40 Years after *Conſtantius*. *Luddus* and *Cambden* aſſert us to have ſetl'd here, under *Fergus* the Second, in the Reign of *Honorius*, at which time *Fergus* the Second did reign. *Uſher* relates only the three Authorities of thoſe ridiculous Legends; and the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* fixes on the year 503, and ſo contradicts not only our Hiſtorians, but * *Luddus* and † *Cambden* in making *Fergus* the Second near 100 years later, than truly he was.

* Pag. 62.
† Cap. Scoti.

As

As theſe few prime and late Authors who controvert our Antiquity, differ thus in the names of our firſt Kings, and the time of their ſettlement in *Scotland*; ſo they differ in theſe following cardinal Points of their new invented Hypotheſis. The Biſhop of * St. *Aſaph* thinks it neceſſary for maintaining that the *Scots* ſetl'd not till the year 503, to aſſert that *the* Picts *fill'd all the Northern Parts of* Britain, *and that thoſe* Picts *were a ruder ſort of* Britains, *divided in* South *and* North Picts; in which he follows * *Cambden*, yet with this difference, implying a contradiction, that *Cambden* makes theſe *Deucaledones* and *Vecturiones*, to ſignify by a *Britiſh* derivation, *Picts*, to the *Eaſt and Weſt*: Whereas the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, from a *Britiſh* derivation of the ſame words, calls them *Southern* and *Northern Picts*. But *Cambden* does acknowledge plainly that in this Derivation, he differs from the venerable *Beda*, whoſe Authority he truly foretels will weigh down the Reaſons he brings for his Conjecture. And as he, contrary to the univerſally receiv'd opinion, denies the

* Cap. 1.

* Camb. Cap. Pict.

the *Picts* to be *Schythians*, tho they were really ſo, he makes the *Scots* to be *Schythians*, though really they were not ſo.

* *Uſher* not having conſidered all the Scheme and Conſequences of this new Hypotheſis (as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* has done with more cunning) follows *Beda* in bringing the *Picts* from *Schythia*, but he differs from *Beda* in that he brings them hither after our Saviour's Birth, and produces ſuch Authors as he uſes in our occaſions, who aſſign three different Periods of time for their ſettlement; the laſt whereof, and to which he inclines, is ſaid to be under the Emperours *Gratian* and *Valentinian*; and ſo makes the *Scots* and *Picts* to have come in together about the year 400, and yet he finds no inconveniency in bringing us to *Scotland* under *Gathelus* and *Scota*, and in aſſerting that we ſetled firſt in *Galloway*, whereas none of our Hiſtorians do ſay that *Gathelus* and *Scota* came to *Scotland*, and the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* and *Cambden* aſſert our deſcent from *Scota* to be a Fiction; and the Biſhop of St.

* De Primord. cap. 11. init.

* Cap. 1. St. *Asaph* * confesses us to have *first fixt in* Argile.

Another material difference amongst them is, that the Bishop of † Cap. 1. Sect. 12, & 13. St. *Asaph* † confines us and the *Picts*, for 1000 years be-north *Grahams Dike*, call'd *Severus Wall*, beyond *Clyde* and *Forth*. Whereas *Cambden* ‖ Cap. Pict. ‖ asserts that *Edinburgh* was the chief Seat of the Kings of the *Picts*, and derives the names of *Louthian*, *Edingburgh*, and *Pictland*, from *Pictish* words.

From all which it clearly appears, that no weight is to be laid on such irreconcileable Authors; and yet by these only, is the Antiquity of of our Kings and Nation controverted. But to confirm fully our History from *Julius Cæsar*'s time, and to shew that the *British* Historians do not only contradict one another, but do contradict the two only ancient Historians, who could understand any thing of our Origine, as being the eldest and most deserving of all their own Authors, *viz. Gildas* and *Beda*; I do appeal to them. And I begin with *Beda*, because he is most full, and interprets the other.

The

The venerable *Beda*, tho a *Saxon* himself, and so an Enemy to us, having written an exact Chronology, according to the periods of time; does in his first *cap. de* * *priscis incolis*, tell us, that God *was praised in five languages in this Isle, that of the* English, Britains, Scots, Picts, *and* Latines: and then proceeds to tell, that *the* Britains *were the first possessors, and possest the south parts, after which came the* Picts *to the northern parts, and the* Scots *under* Reuda, *thereafter made a third Nation, in that part belonging to the* Picts, getting the *western* part of *Scotland*, *North* from the *Picts*, called *Dumbriton*, or *Alcluith*. And he inculcates their fixing here, by three several, but concuring Expressions. 1. *Progressi ex Hibernia, they left* Ireland. 2. *Sedes vindicarunt in Britannia, they setled in* Britain. 3. *In Britannia Britonibus & Pictis gentem tertiam addiderunt*, they *added a third Nation to the* Britains *and* Picts. And that this was very ancient is clear; for he fixes them in *Britain* in that Chapter wherein he treats *de priscis incolis*; and having thus setled the *Scots* and *Picts* in his first

* *Quinque gentium linguis unam eandemque summæ veritatis, & veræ sublimitatis scientiam scrutatur, confitetur* Anglorum, *viz.* Britonum, Scotorum, *&c.* Bed. *l.* 1. *cap.* 1. *Eccl. Hist.*

first Chapter with the *Britains*; he proceeds in the second Chapter to settle the fourth Nation, *viz.* the *Latines* or *Romans*, beginning with these words,* *But this Britain was unknown, and not entred upon by the Romans, till* Julius Cæsar's *time.* And having describ'd the Wars betwixt these three Nations and the *Roman Emperours*, in a due gradation, marking every period of time through the Reign of their consecutive *Emperors*; and how at last the *Romans* had abandon'd the *Island*, and *Ætius* the *Roman Consul*, had refus'd the Petition of the miserable *Britains*, so often defeated by the *Scots* and *Picts*: he in the 14 *Cap.* relates how the *Britains* upon deep consultation, brought in the *Saxons*, and from thence continues the *Saxon* History. This being the tract of *Beda*'s History; Is there any place to doubt but that the *Scots* were setled before the *Saxons*? For the Wars betwixt the *Romans* and *Scots* are related exactly before any mention is made of the *Saxons*; and at last they are only brought in to assist the *Britains* against the *Scots* and *Picts*, because the

* *Verum eadem Britannia Romanis usque ad Caium* Jul. Cæs. *inaccessa atque incognita fuit* Beda *Hist. Eccles. l.* 1. *cap.* 2.

the *Britains* were deſerted by the *Romans*, and conſequently the *Saxons* having been brought in *Anno* 449, it unanſwerably follows, that the *Scots* were ſetl'd here, and made a third Nation, long before the 503, as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* alledges, at which time he makes us to have ſetl'd here very cunningly, but not ſincerely, upon deſign to make us later than the *Engliſh*. As alſo it appears very clearly that the *Scots* ſetl'd here even before *Julius Cæſar*'s time, for after *Beda* (who proceeds exactly according to the Periods of Time) had ſetl'd us in *Britain*, he tells, * that *this* Britain *was unknown to the* Romans, and deſcrib'd what theſe *Romans* did in the Iſle, and how they fought with the *Picts* and *Us* under their ſubſequent *Emperors*, without ever ſpeaking again of the entry of the *Scots*, as having ſetl'd them in the firſt Chapter, before *Cæſar*'s time. Nor is the time alter'd in any other Period; and he is ſo careful of the Period of time, that he ſubjoyns to his Work a Chronological Recapitulation, which is very exact. And he being a *Saxon*, had

* *Verum eadem Britannia Romanis uſque ad Caium* Julius Cæſ. *inacceſſa atque incognita fuit.* Beda *Eccleſ. Hiſt. l.* 1. *cap.* 2.

had certainly told (as the Bishop now does) that the *Saxons* were elder than we, if this had been true; which is a demonstration according to the Rules of Chronology, against the Bishop of St. *Asaph*. It may be some may wonder why *Beda* mentions not our coming under *Fergus* the first; and some may object, that in this we go higher than *Beda*. To which it is answered, That our History confesses, that the *Scots* came over from *Ireland* at several times: Once under *Fergus* the first, but not being numerous enough, *Reutherus* brought over another recruit, and thereafter *Fergus* the second brought over others after his Predecessor *Eugenius* was expell'd by the *Romans* and *Britains*. And in so old Antiquity, it's much for *Beda*, even to know the Descent under *Reuda*. And whereas the Bishop quarrels *Beda*, that he gives no Authority for this: The Reply is, that if it were requisite, then one Author behov'd to give another, and he a third, *& sic in infinitum*. Nor did ever any Man before him require an Authority in so ancient

an

an Author: and this Anſwer is a full proof of the Biſhop's Conviction, who being abſolutely gravel'd here, he grows as angry at *Beda*, as at our Hiſtorians, and tells, diſdainfully, that *this might be true for ought* Beda *knew*, and adds, that the *Scots* were indeed here in *Beda's* time, and he ſpeaks according to his own time, which were to make *Beda* ſpeak great non-ſenſe. For *Beda* ſpeaks here of the *preterit*, and not the *preſent* time, *viz.* The firſt Vaſtations ſpoke of by *Gildas*, and we ſhall ſee that others, who lived in the time agree with him.

The ſecond Citation I ſhall bring from *Beda*, ſhall be from the 5*th cap. l.* 1. *Eccl. Hiſt.* where he ſays, that * *Severus built a Wall to defend againſt the other unconquer'd Nations*, and in the 12 *cap.* he tells that † *Britain was vex'd by the* Scots *and* Picts, *two over-Sea, or Tranſmarine Nations*; and thereafter, as if he had been afraid that this word *Tranſmarine*, might have been miſtaken, he adds,

* Bed. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 5. *Eccl. Hiſt. Itaque* Severus *magnam foſſam firmiſſimumque vallum crebris in ſuper turribus communitum a mari ad mare duxit.*

† Bed. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. *Eccl. Hiſt. Denique ſubito duabus gentibus tranſmarinis vehementer ſævis, Scotorum a circio, Pictorum ab Aquilone multos ſtupet gemitque per annos.*

‖ that *they were not call'd Transmarine, because they liv'd, and were setled out of* Britain; *but because they were separated from that part of* Britain *by the two Seas, which did almost meet.* And in this he agrees exactly with *Tacitus*, who in the Life of *Agricola*, says, that *there being a Wall built betwixt these two Seas, the Roman Enemies were closed up as in an Isle.* By this place of *Beda* it is also very clear, that the *Scots* were setled in *Britain* whilst the *Romans* fought against the *Picts* and *Scots*, and consequently before they were call'd by the *Picts* to defend them against the *Saxons*, as is alledged by the *Bishop*. If the *Scots* had not been living in this Isle at that time, the explication of *Transmarine* had been both ridiculous and untrue. And as it is not presumable that the venerable *Beda* would have asserted this, if he had not certainly known it; so it was very easy for him to know it, that being so publick a thing, which concern'd his own, as well as his Neighbour Nation. But if the *Scots* had setled in *anno* 503, *Beda* could not have call'd them * *Prisci incolæ*, and reckon'd them amongst

‖ *Transmarinas autem dicimus has gentes, non quod extra Britanniam essent positæ, sed quia a parte Britonum erant remotæ, duobus finibus mari interjacentibus, quorum unus ab orientali mari, alter ab occidentali, Britanniæ terras longe lateque irrumpit quamvis ad se invicem pertinere possint.*

* Cap. 1.

amongſt the ancient Inhabitants. For a Man living in his time, might have told him, that his Father ſaw the *Scots* call'd over by the *Picts*, and that they ſettled here in his time. *Beda* being thus clear to a Demonſtration, as far as Chronology and Hiſtory can allow: I deſire to know how what *Gildas* ſays, can contradict our Hiſtory, ſince he copies *Gildas*, and liv'd within 200 years of him? and ſince both wrote the ſame Actions in almoſt the ſame words? Or how can it be imagin'd, that if *Gildas* had known our Origin to be ſo late, he would not have told it to our diſadvantage? whereas on the contrary, he ſpeaks of *Scots* and *Picts* as living in this Iſle, after the ſame manner as *Tranſmarine*, in the ſame ſenſe, in which *Beda* interprets it; which is, becauſe they liv'd not without the Iſle, but on the other ſide of the Wall, which made an Iſle. From which it follows neceſſarily that in *Gildas*'s time, the *Scots* dwelt not without the Iſle of *Britain*; and *Gildas* having been born in *Anno* 493, as is ſaid in the Calculation prefix'd to that

* Pag. 1120. *num. edit.* Heidelberg.

* Edition, which himſelf relates, it is clear that he was born 10 Years before that Year, in which the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* pretends we firſt ſettled here; and ſo certainly he could not but have taken notice of the ſettlement of a Nation, in which he was ſo much concern'd. And albeit he ſays once, ſpeaking of us, that *Hiberni revertuntur domum.* Yet that was ſpoke of us as ſettl'd here, and as being *Iriſh* by extraction, as ſhall be hereafter clear'd. Nor muſt our Hiſtories which are ſo poſitive and unanimous, be overturn'd by Clenſhes and Equivocations, and remote weak Conſequences, without Authors living at the time, and mentioning expreſsly ſo remarkable an Accident.

SECT. 5. Proofs from Foreign Authors.

Before I enter upon Foreign Citations without the Iſle, I muſt obſerve, that we having kept the *Romans* (the only writing Nation that had any knowledg of theſe our Iſles) from entering our Kingdom; they could not know our Antiquities, as they did thoſe of *England* or *France*, whom they had conquer'd.

But

But our being engag'd in a conſtant War with them, is ſo univerſally related by all their Hiſtorians; that to deny our being a Nation, and in *Britain*, when they ſo frequently and unanimouſly writ of us, *as Gens, & Gens etiam Britannica*, fighting here, cannot but ſeem Railery to any Serious Man: and the being able to controvert it, is rather a mark of nimbleneſs of Wit, than skill in Antiquity. But however I ſhall produce ſome few Foreign Authors, whoſe Teſtimonies ſeem to me unanſwerable, being joyn'd with, and illuſtrated by what I formerly ſaid from the venerable *Beda*, and the Hiſtorians within this Iſle.

Eumenius.

My firſt Author is *Eumenius* in his *Panegyrick* to *Conſtantine* in praiſe of his Father *Conſtantius*: who preferring the Victory *Conſtantius* had over the *Britains*, to that which *Julius Cæſar* had over them; ſays, * *that the* Britains *at the time* Cæſar *conquer'd them, were a rude Nation, being only us'd to fight againſt the* Picts, *and* Iriſh *of the* Britiſh Country, *Enemies half naked, and ſo eaſily yeilded to the* Roman *Arms and Enſigns.* By

* Pag. 258.

which Citation, we contend that it is prov'd, that in the time of *Julius Cæsar*, there was another Nation beside the *Picts*, who then inhabited *Britain*, and were a Colony of the *Irish*; and these must certainly have been the *Scots*. For it cannot be pretended, that ever there was another Colony of the *Irish* in *Britain*, besides us. And it is uncontroverted on all hands, that we are that Colony of the *Irish*, who only us'd to fight with the *Picts*, against the *Britains*, and therefore that answer made by the Bishop, that this place relates only to the *Irish*, and not to the *Scots*, is of no moment. But he has another Answer, which his Lordship insists more upon; and for clearing whereof, I must cite the Latin; *Ad hæc natio etiam tunc rudis, & soli* Britanni Pictis *modo, &* Hibernis *assueta hostibus, adhuc seminudis, facile* Romanis *armis signisque cesserunt.* His Answer is, that the words, *Soli Britanni*, are the Nominative, and not the Genitive, and
*Pag. 11. his Lordship confesses, * *that if the words be in the Genitive*, they are clear of *Buchannan*'s side. And that they

they are of the Genitive, all diſintereſted Men, who underſtand the Latin, will confeſs. And *Cambden* himſelf, tho a learned Schoolmaſter, and in other Citations about our Antiquity, ſomewhat more humourous, than ſo worthy a Man needed to be, truſts to no other Anſwer, but that the Panegyriſt ſpoke here, according to the Conception of the Age wherein he liv'd. But, as any Citation may be thus anſwered; ſo if he had not ſpoken with relation to the time of *Julius Cæſar*, the Compariſon and Complement had no great force. The Learned *Uſſher* likewiſe objects not this to *Buchannan*, which ſhews alſo his Acquieſcence. 2. If this, *Natio Rudis*, had been the ſame thing with *Soli Britanni*; and if the ſence muſt be, as his Lordſhip ſays, a *Rude Nation*, *the Britains*; then not only it had been ſuperfluous, but inconſiſtent with true ſence. For how can the ſame thing be copulated with it-ſelf? and tho it may be ſaid, *Natio rudis Soli Britanni, aſſueta hoſtibus*; yet certainly *aſſueti* had been more elegant for an Orator, if *Soli Britanni* had been the Nominative.

And the great * *Joseph Scaliger*, one of the best Judges both for that kind of Learning and Disinteressedness, exclaims against *Luddus*, for misconstructing so the words; and therefore the Bishop might have spared the saying, * *that* Cambden *ought to have given* Buchannan *correction*; for the great *Joseph Scaliger*, and *Buchannan*, that incomparable *Humanist*, are fitter to give, than receive Correction from any in the Isle, or Age.

* In not. in lib. 4. Tibull.

* Pag. 11.

I must also observe, that the Bishop has pointed these words otherways than they are in the Author: for in the Author (of *Paulus Stephanus*, and *Plantins* Editions, who were the most learned and exact of all Printers) there is no *Comma* immediately after tthe words, *Soli Britanni*, and it is pointed as I have set it down here, and even * *Luddus* is just here. But the Bishop has very wittily added the *Comma* after these words. Now without the *Comma*, it is clear, that the *Panegyrist* meant *Pictis & Hibernis Soli Britanni*; and if the *Panegyrist* had design'd his words should have been construed, as the Bishop has con-

* Pag. 37.

strú'd

ſtru'd them; ſo great an Orator would certainly have ſaid, *Soli Britanni Natio ad hoc etiam tunc rudis*, &c. And in this caſe the words had been clear, and the ingenious Biſhop needed not, in tranſlating them, to have been forc'd to uſe the word * *Nation* twice, becauſe the ſenſe was hard and unnatural, according to his Conſtruction. And whereas the Biſhop pretends, * that *the words conſtrued according to* Buchannan, *would not have run ſo ſtrong in the Compariſon: for the ſtrength of the Compariſon lies*, ſaith he, *in that* Julius Cæſar's *Victory was not ſo great, as that of* Conſtantius, *becauſe* Cæſar *overcame a Nation, yet rude and unskilful of War, and only* Britains, *a Nation us'd to no other Enemies but* Picts *and* Iriſh: Whereas *Conſtantius* overcame *Carauſius*, who had got a *Roman Legion* on his ſide, *&c.* But by his Lordſhip's favour, the Compariſon runs ſtrong enough thus, according to *Buchannan's* Conſtruction. Cæſar *overcame the* Britains *when they were yet a rude Nation, us'd only to fight againſt the* Picts *and* Iriſh *who liv'd upon the Land, or*

* Pag. 12.

* Pag. *ibid.*

Iſle

Isle of Britain: *but* Conſtantius *overcame them after they had been long train'd up in War.* And certainly a Nation is a far more formidable Enemy after their being long train'd up in War, than when yet rude, and unexperienc'd; tho they had had the acceſſion of a *Roman Legion*; which could ſignify nothing againſt a whole *Roman Army.* Nor does it follow, that the words muſt be ill conſtrued; if ſo, the Compariſon would be ſtronger: for it is ſufficient to ſuſtain the Conſtruction, that in the Compariſon *Conſtantius* was to be preferr'd in the way I have mention'd. 4. If there were any doubtfulneſs in theſe words, as there is none; yet they ought to be interpreted ſo, as to conſiſt with other Authors and Hiſtories, and eſpecially with *Beda:* for in our ſence, they confirm his Chronological Account, of our being in this Iſle before *Julius Cæſar's* time: And the Biſhop muſt ſtill remember, that he cannot overturn our receiv'd Hiſtories, except he produce Arguments which infallibly conclude againſt them: It being a Rule in Law, that, *Verba ſemper ſunt in-*

interpretanda potius, ut ſcriptura, vel actus ſubſiſtat; quam ut deſtruatur. This ſhews alſo that in *Conſtantius*'s time, which was about the Year 300, the *Britains* were *aſſueti, us'd to fight* with the *Scots* and *Picts*: and this uſe muſt imply a long time. And ſo it's very probable, that we had frequent Wars with the *Britains* long before this time, and conſequently the Biſhop errs, * aſſerting, *We were not in* Britain *even by way of incurſion, till the year* 300. If it be objected, that in the Phraſe *Soli Britanni*, *Britanni* is a Subſtantive; *Britannici* being ſtill the Adjective; and therefore theſe words muſt be conſtrued to be the Nominative Caſe, as the Bp of St. *Aſaph* alledgeth. I prove the contrary by *Lucretius*.

* Sect. 5, 6. cap. 1.

Nam quid Britannum *Cœlum differre putamus*, &c.

Claudianus *de quarto conſulatu* Honorii

Terribilis Mauro, debellatorq; Britanni *Littoris.*

A further Confirmation of this ariſes from the ſame *Eumenius*, in this

this ſame *Panegyrick*; where ſpeaking of *Conſtantius*'s Victory over this Iſland, he ſaith, *Neq; enim ille, tot tantiſq; rebus geſtis, non dico* Caledonum *aliorumque* Pictorum *ſilvas & paludes, ſed nec* Hiberniam *proximam, nec* Thulen *ultimam, nec ipſæ ſi quæ ſunt, fortunatarum Inſulas, dignabitur acquirere.* And tho *Uſher* foreſeeing the force of this Argument, endeavours to elude it by contending, that by the *Caledonii*, are here meant the *Picts*, becauſe the words *aliorumque Pictorum*, had elſe been impertinent. Yet to make the *Scots* not to be *Caledonians* in ancient Authors, were too great a Task even for *Uſher*; that being contrary to the univerſally receiv'd opinion of all the Learned, * ſome of which I have cited in the Margin: but for a further Proof, I ſhall here cite a *Roman* that liv'd very near *Eumenius*'s time, and who almoſt ſpeaks in the ſame words with him, *Latinus Pacatius Drepanius*, who in his *Panegyrick* to *Theodoſius* the elder, who

* *Guidus pancirollus coment. ad notitiam imperii occident.* p. 159. where he cites for this *Dion. Euſebius & Spartianus*, and ſays that *Caledonia apud eos nunc Scotia dicitur Dion. in vita Severi Imp. Anno* 207, *Bergier l.* 1. *c.* 10.

liv'd

liv'd *Anno* 367, complements him upon * having reduc'd the *Scots* to their Mariſhes, ſhewing that the *Sylvæ*, and *Paludes Caledonum*, were the *Scotorum Sylvæ*: though Strangers in thoſe ancient times, could little diſtinguiſh *Picts* from *Scots*. And from which I further evince, that the *Scots* before the year 400, dwelt in in *Scotland*, as their own Country; elſe it had been impertinent and untrue to ſay, that *the* Scots *were reduced to their own Mariſhes.*

* Pag. 248. Edit. Plantin. *Redactum ad paludes ſuas Scotum.*

Having thus ſhown that the *Scots* were *Caledonians:* It clearly follows, that all the ancient Authors who write of the *Caledonii*, prove the Antiquity of the *Scots*; and therefore *Valerius Flaccus* proves our Antiquity, who writing to *Domitian*, in praiſe of his Father *Veſpaſian*, who was known to have made War with us about the year 70 after Chriſt, ſays,

—Caledonius, *poſtquam tua Carbaſa vexit.*
Oceanus Phrygios prius indignatus Julos.

And

* Lib. 10. Epig. 44.

And * *Martial*, who liv'd alſo in *Domitian*'s time, ſays,

Quinte Caledonios, Ovide viſure Britannos,
Et viridem Tethyn Oceanumque Patrem.

Next to theſe I cite *Tacitus*, who in the Life of *Agricola*, brings in that famous *Galgacus*, who fought with the *Romans*, near to the *Grampian* Hills. And that he was a *Scotiſh* King, or *Leader*, is confirm'd from * *Lipſius*, who calls him *Galgacus Scotus*. This is alſo confirm'd by the exact and noble *French* Manuſcript foreſaid; which ſays, that *Dardan* was choſen, becauſe *Galdus* was not of Age: Alluding to our old Law, appointing that the immediate Heir of the Crown, being by his Infancy unable to govern, the Government ſhould in that caſe be devolved upon the next, who was able to govern: which Law was ſo ancient, that it is ſaid to be enacted immediately upon the Death of *Fergus* the Firſt. And by *Bergier*,

* Comment. ad vitam Agricolæ.

gier, afterwards the King's Advocate of *France*, who in his learn'd History of the High-ways of *Rome*, * calls him *Prince of the* Caledonians, *or the* Scots. And to what better Judges can we appeal, in a matter concerning *Roman* Antiquities, and the ſenſe of a *Roman* Author, than to thoſe two, who are the moſt famous of all the *Roman* Antiquaries: the one having written a Book concerning the *Roman* Greatneſs, and the other concerning the Magnificence of the *Romans* in their High-ways. Nor could he be an *Iriſh* King; for what had an *Irish* King to do with an Army in the midſt of *Scotland*, and againſt the *Romans*, with whom no *Irish* King ever fought. And that he was no *Britain*, is clear from the Speech he made to his Souldiers, telling them that they had never been conquer'd, *ſervitutis expertes, & nullæ ultra terræ.* Nor can any thing agree better with our being ſtill call'd one of the two unconquer'd Nations, by *Gildas*, *Beda*, and others. This is yet further clear'd by another Paſſage in this ſame

* Lib. 1. cap. 10. numb. 9. *Prince des Caledonienſ. ou Eſcoſſois.*

* *Petruccio Ubaldini*, alſo in *deſcritt. de la Scotia*, p. 4. & 5. aſſerts the *Scots* to be *Caledonians.*

ſame Life of *Agricola*; wherein * *Tacitus* ſays, *The third Year of the War diſcovered new Nations, which* Agricola *conquer'd, even to the River* Tay. And after this he adds, Agricola *having beat* Galgacus *near to the* Grampian *Hills, brought back the* Roman *Army to the Borders of the* Horeſti; *and having received Hoſtages from them, he ordered the Commander of the* Roman *Fleet to ſail about the Iſle.* From which I deduce, firſt, that *Galgacus* was no *Britan*: For *Tacitus* ſays, that *the third Year opened new Nations*: whereas *Agricola* knew the *Britans* before; and theſe muſt have been the *Scots* and *Picts*: for they could not be any other, being beyond the River *Tay*. And *Galgacus* could be no *Pictiſh* King; for we have a Manuſcript, bearing all the Names of the Pictiſh Kings. 2. From this paſſage it is clear, that *Cambden* does err groſly, in making the *Horeſti* to be a People in *Eskdale*, which is a Scotiſh Country on the Borders of *England*. For (beſide that all Authors agree, that they are known to be the Inhabitants of *Angus*, and *Merns*) it is here demonſtrated

* Tit. vit. Agric. c. 22. *Tertius expeditionis annus novas gentes aperuit: vaſtatis uſque ad* Tuam (*æſtuarit nomen eſt*) *nationibus* Agricola *in fines* Horeſtorum *exercitum deduxit: ibi acceptis obſidibus præfecto Claſſis circumvehi* Britanniam *præcepit*, &c.

ſtrated by *Tacitus*, that after the *Romans* paſt *Forth*, they came to *Tay*, (which is known to be the Marches or Boundary of *Angus*) and from thence they marched to the *Grampian* Hills, where they fought with *Galgacus*: And from which he return'd to the Borders of the *Horeſti*, where finding the Fleet in the *Frith* of *Tay*, where he had left it, he Embarqu'd the Hoſtages, and ſent the Fleet back to that part of *Britain* whence they came. And how could all this be in *Eskdale*? That being very remote from the place of Battel; and *Eskdale* an inland Country, very remote from all Sea. 3. *Tacitus* writing of us, under the name of *Caledonians*, mentions the Mariſhes of thoſe who fought, which were appropriated to us by *Eumenius* and *Pacatius*, as I formerly obſerv'd. By all which we may obſerve, how little Engliſh Writers are to be credited, when they write upon deſign to leſſen our Country, or magnify their own. And all this is confirm'd by the learned * *Ferrarius* a ſtranger. And to this I may add, that we have to this

* Lex. Geograph. verb. Horreſti.

day, a Barony, call'd *Galdgirth*, or the *Girth* of *Galdus*; and ten great Stones in *Galloway*, called *King Galdus*'s Monument: Marks of Antiquity far preferable to any Manuſcript; as the teſtimony or conſent of a whole Nation, is to that of one privat Perſon. Two of which Arguments are us'd by *Chambers*, in the Life of *Galdus*: and he had ſeen *Verimund*, and our old Manuſcripts: And ſhould he not then be our King *Galdus*, who reigned at that time, and who (as all our Hiſtories relate) fought againſt the *Romans*, in this place, which was within the Scotiſh Territories?

SENECA.

The third Citation, ſhall be from *Seneca*; and is a clear teſtimony for us in the judgment of the great * *Scaliger.*

Ille Britannos *ultra noti littora ponti,*
Et cæruleos Scoto-Brigantes *dare* Romuleis,
Colla catenis juſſit, & ipſum nova Romanæ,
Jura ſecuris tremere oceanum.

* *Scalig. ad lib.* 4. *Tibul. ad Meſſal.*

And in his Notes on *Euſebius ad Annum* MMLX, Where there is a moſt learned and full proof of our Antiquity, too long to be inſerted here, and too learn'd to be anſwered by any Adverſary.

To

* To which *Cambden* answers, That for *Scoto-Brigantes*, we should read *Scuta-Brigantes*. But this is very ridiculous; for we read, that the *Picts* were call'd *Picti*, for painting their Bodies; but never for painting their Shields. I know likewise, that *Hadrianus Junius* reads *Cute-Brigantes*; but this would be ill verse: for the first syllable in *Cute*, is by it's own nature, short; but according to this reading it would be long. I might to this add that Answer made by *Florus*, the Poet, to *Adrian* in *Spartianus*.

* *Ovid. Salmas. in Solin.*

Ego nolo Cæsar *esse*,
Ambulare per Britannos,
Scoticas *pati pruinas*.

For why should we read, *Scythicas*? since *Adrian* was never in *Scythia*; but did fight against the Scots: and caus'd make the *vallum Adriani*.

2. Why should not rather *Scotia*, than *Scythia* be joyn'd to *Britannia*? as* *Usher* argues most justly upon the like occasion. 3. the *Pruinæ Scoticæ* were famous about that time: for *Claudian* hath,

* Cap. p. 723. *de primord.*

* C. 16. p. 728. * *Ille* Caledoniis *poſuit qui caſtra pruinis.*

And *Claudian* does ſo expreſly and ſo frequently ſpeak of the Scots as ſetled here, and deſcribes them to be thoſe People, who conſtantly fought againſt the *Romans*, with the *Picts*; that the citing him againſt us, may convince the Reader, that our Adverſaries are not ſerious. Which will appear when I have cited and illuſtrated him.

In his *Panegyrick*, upon the third *conſulat.* of *Honorius*, he complements him upon the victory of his Gandfather *Theodoſius*, who behov'd to come into *Britain* long before the Year 382, wherein *Theodoſius* his Father was choſen *Emperour.*

Facta tui numerabat avi, quem littus aduſti
Horreſcit Lybii, ratibuſq; impervia Thule.
Ille leves Mauros, *nec falſo nomine* Pictos,
Edomuit, Scotumque *vago mucrone ſecutus.* *Fregit*

Fregit hyperboreas remis audacibus undas.

And in the fourth *Conſulat* of the ſame *Honorius*.

Ille Caledoniis *poſuit qui caſtra pruinis.*
———*maduerunt* Saxone *fuſo*
Orcades, *incaluit* Pictorum *ſanguine* Thule.
Scotorũ *cumulos flevit glacialis* Ierne.

And *de bello Getico*, he ſpeaks of the Roman Legion that return'd from fighting with the *Picts*, and us; (of which * *Beda* makes expreſs mention.)

* Bed. *Eccleſ. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

Venit & extremis legio prætenta Britannis,
Quæ Scoto *dat fræna truci, ferroq; notatas*
Perlegit exanimes Picto *moriente figuras.*

That all this is applicable to us, is clear: becauſe, 1. We had War with the *Romans*, and the *Iriſh* had not. And all theſe Verſes in *Claudian*, are ſpoke to magnify the *Ro-*

man Conqueſt. 2. Since we have prov'd, by other Authors, that the Scots were ſetled here, it is proper and ſuitable to common ſenſe, to apply the ſame to us only, as being the only Perſons concern'd in thoſe Battels; and to the Iſle, in which it is known that the ſame were fought. And theſe Paſſages are attributed to us by *Selden*, l. 2. c. 8. *Mar. Clauſ.*

3. Have the Iriſh made any mention of this War, in any of their Hiſtories? and conſequently, though *Scotia* had been a common Name to *Scotland* and *Ireland* in thoſe days; yet the Circumſtances of the Action, related by the Poet, determine which of the two is here meant.

This is yet further clear from the Panegyrick of *Sidonius Appollinaris.*

——*Victricia* Cæſar
Signa Caledonios *tranſvexit aduſq;* Britannos.
Fuderit & quamquam Scotum, *& cum* Saxone Pictum.

As to which, all that *Cambden* (much better acquainted with citing,

ting, than reaſoning) can anſwer; is, 1. That *the Poet here wrote a Complement according to the vulgar Opinion of his own Times, which cannot be true,* (as he ſays) *becauſe the* Saxons *were not then come to* Britain. But he ſhould have conſidered, that, 1. If this was the Opinion in *Sidonius*'s Age, who liv'd *Anno* 480, * as *Geſner* affirms, which was very near to *Claudian*'s Time, who liv'd in 497, as the Biſhop of * St. *Aſaph* calculates: we muſt conclude, that it is the rather to be believ'd, that then the Scots liv'd here, for that is not inconſiſtent with Hiſtory as the other is, and ſo ſhould be believ'd, though the other be not. 2. There were *Saxons* living then in *Zetland* or *Orknes*, tho they were not ſetled in *Britain*; as is clear by *Claudian* himſelf, who ſays———

* *Geſner* in *verb. Sidonius.*

* Pag. 8.

Maduerunt Saxone fuſo Orcades.

And whereas it is ſaid, that

—*Flevit glacialis Jerne,*

Does make the ſame applicable to *Ire-*

land, ſince *Jerna* is call'd *Ireland*. To this it is anſwered, that, 1. It is clear, that there is a Country in *Scotland*, call'd *Jerna*, near to which the *Romans* had a noble Camp, and whereof the Veſtiges are very remarkable to this day; and in which, there are Stones found with Roman Inſcriptions, deſigning the Stations of the Legions. And certainly it is more proper to ſay, the loſs was lamented in that Country where the Battel was fought, than in that Kingdom where the Romans never fought any. And why did the Poet join *Jerna* in the ſame lamentation with *Caledonia*? if he had not deſign'd by it, to expreſs *Jerna*, as a part of our *Scotland*. And this is more proper, than to make the Poet join part of one, to another different, and remote Kingdom. As alſo *Starthern* in *Scotland*, is indeed a place, where the Froſt is ſtrong, and continues long, as being very near the Hills. But *Ireland* was known to be, and is yet a Country much freer from Storms and Ice; and was believ'd by the Ancients to be ſo, as is moſt clear by

by * *Beda*. 2. Though the Poet had underſtood *Ireland*, by *Jerne*; yet it does not follow, that becauſe *Ireland* lamented the loſs of the Scots who were kill'd here; that therefore the Scots that were kill'd, were not the Scots that were planted in *Scotland*: ſince certainly, *Ireland* could not but have lamented even the death of Scots, who were ſetled here; as *Scotland*, and as the Scots here did lament very much the death of the Scots who were kill'd in *Ireland* in the late Maſſacre. And as the Biſhop himſelf argues in the Caſe of the *Panegyrick* above-cited, I may far more juſtly argue here, that this ſenſe agrees better with the Poet's noble flight, who makes the loſs that the Scots ſuſtained to be ſo great, that it was lamented even in *Ireland*. *Selden* alſo, *l.* 2. *c.* 8. *Mar. Clauſ.* applys this to us, and not to the Iriſh. And theſe Verſes in the ſame Author, deſign'd likewiſe to the praiſe of the ſame *Theodoſius*,

* Lib. 1. cap. 1.

——————— Pictos
Edomuit, Scotumq; *vaga mucrone ſecutus*, *Fregit*

Fregit hyperboreas remis audacibus undas.

Are only applicable to the Scotiſh Colony ſetled in *Ireland*. For he magnifies *Theodoſius*, Grand-father to *Honorius*, for having purſued ſo far his Victory, that he beat the Northern Seas with his bold Oars. Now, beſide all the other Arguments formerly us'd, can it be ſaid, that *Theodoſius*'s Souldiers ever went to *Ireland*? that *Ireland* lies North-weſt from *Clyde*, or *Severus Wall*? Whereas it is certain they were in *Scotland*; and it is very probable that they would follow the Scotiſh Colony into the North-weſt Iſles, or over *Clyde*, where it's formerly prov'd the Scotiſh Plantation firſt ſetled.

The Third Teſtimony, ſhall be that of * *Hegiſippus*, where he brings in *Ben-gorion* diſſwading

* Lib. 1. cap. 1. Hegeſippus *de excidio Hieroſol.* 5. Cap. 15.

Quid vobis cum victoribus univerſæ terræ? quibus ſecreta Oceani, & extrema Indiæ parent. Quid attexam Britannias interfuſo mari toto orbe diviſas, & à Romanis in orbem terrarum redactas. Tremit hos Scotia *qua terris nihil debet.*

the

the *Jews* to fight againſt *the* Romans, *the Conquerors of all the Earth, whom the unſearchable Places of the Ocean, and the furtheſt places of* India, *obey. What ſhall I ſay of the Iſles of* Britain, *divided from the reſt of the World by Sea, and redu'd by the* Romans *to be a part of the World; who makes* Scotland *to tremble, which owes nothing to any part of the Earth?* To which *Cambden* anſwers, That this muſt be interpreted of *Ireland*, becauſe the words, *Quæ terris nihil debet*, muſt be interpreted, as if the *Scotia* here ſpoke of, were joyn'd to no other place; and that is only applicable to *Ireland*, and not to *Scotland*. But what a hard ſhift is he here driven to: for none can interpret, *Quæ terris nihil debet*, in that ſenſe, there being nothing more different, than theſe two expreſſions, *which is not joyn'd to the other Parts of the Earth*, as *Cambden* would interpet it; and, *which owes nothing to any part of the Earth*, as the Author expreſſes it. There is nothing more ordinary, than for one who thinks he depends not upon another, to ſay, *I owe you nothing.*

And

And certainly it agrees much more with the Author's Intention, to interpret theſe words ſo, *Scotland, which ow'd homage to no place, does tremble at the Roman Arms.* 2. It cannot be ſaid that ever the *Romans* did attack *Ireland.* And to clear this, beyond anſwer, in the ſame harangue, cited out of *Ben-gorion* himſelf by *Uſher*, * *Ben-gorion* ſays to the *Jews*, that *when the General of the Nations only came, theſe Nations reſiſted them; but when the* Roman Emperours *themſelves came, they ſubmitted to them.* And I deſire to know, if ever *Ireland* was invaded by the *Romans?* So that what is ſaid in the harangue, is not applicable to the *Scotia Hibernica*, as they pretend; but to that Country wherein we now live. As alſo, by the ſame *Ben-gorion*, it is clear, that *Nero* being diſcourag'd upon the rebellion of the *Jews*, and *Veſpaſian* comming to him, comforted him, by remembering him that *ſome of his Captains had conquer'd all the Weſtern World*, France, Scotland, *and the land of* Tubal. And whereas, *Uſher*, to leſſen this Authority, is forc'd to alledge,

*P. 726, & 727. *Ad quos cum veniſſes dua exercitus Romani, oppoſuerunt ſe illi, nec voluerunt ei ſubditi eſſe: Cum autem Reges Romanorum venerunt, ſubegerunt eos ut ſervirent ipſis.*

ledge, that *Hegesippus*'s Works were spurious. This contradicts * *Eusebius*, who makes him to have liv'd, *Anno Christi* 160. And tho *Usher* contends, that both these Authors must be late, because *Hegesippus*, who only cites *Ben-gorion*, names *Constantinople*, which chang'd not the name of *Bizantium* till about the beginning of the 4*th* Century. Yet the Answer is easie, *viz.* That this being a Translation from the *Greek*, the Translator has us'd the name that was best known in his own Time. And the English, and other Nations have acknowledg'd this to be the Work of *Hegesippus*, and translate it as such. *Usher* himself indeed is inclin'd to think, that this was the Work of *St. Ambrose*: but even that is sufficient for us, for not only is *St. Ambrose* himself older than the 503 Year, and so proves that our Country was before that time called *Scotland*; but *St. Ambrose* relating this Speech made in *Vespasian*'s Time, must prove, that this Country was call'd *Scotland* in *Vespasian*'s Time, who was elected Emperour 72 Years after *Christ*.

* *Vid. cap.* 27. *l.*4. Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.*

Tertullian,

* Tertullian.

* *Tertullian*, who died in the Year 202, and ſo muſt have written ſome time before that, and could not have written of us as Chriſtians, and a Nation, if we had not been ſo, for a conſiderable time: for Informations did ſpread ſlowly in that Age, when there was ſo little Commerce, and at ſo great a diſtance. This great Doctor of the Primitive Church, writing againſt the Jews, who he knew would examine the truth of the matter of Fact alledg'd againſt them, ſays, * for the honour of the *Chriſtian Religion*, which he was defending, That *thoſe Inhabitants of* Britain, *which could not be ſubdu'd by the* Romans, *yet willingly yielded to the Yoke of Chriſt.* From which it is urg'd, that in *Tertullian*'s Time, there were Nations in *Britain* which had never ſubmitted to the Roman Yoke, but yet ſubmitted to the Yoke of Chriſt. But ſo it is that could not be meant of the *Britains*, for all the World knows, and the Biſhop confeſſes, that long before that Time, they had ſubmitted to the Romans. And therefore it is plain, that there were other Nations in the Iſle; and that could not

* Tertul. *l. adverſ. Judeos, c. 7. Et Britannorum Romanis in acceſſa loca, Chriſto vero ſubdita:* which *Baronius* applys to us, *Tom. 3. p. 537. St. Aſaph. Pref.* pag. 2.

not be true, except the Scots, as well as the Picts, had been ſetled in the Iſle at that Time. For a vagrant Company of Robbers, could not be call'd a Nation, or eſteem'd a Church: And this Author writes of Britiſh Nations; we muſt therefore have been a Nation and Church, as the reſt were; and therefore, ſince they were ſetled, ſo muſt we have been. Nor can this be meant of the North and South Picts, though it were prov'd, that the Picts were diſtinguiſh'd into Northern and Southern. For theſe could no more be conſider'd as different People, than the Northern and Southern Engliſh can now be ſaid to be different Nations. 2. That ſenſe was not ſo much for the honour and extent of the Chriſtian Religion: And the Jews might have lookt upon *Tertullian* as a Jugler, for making one Nation appear two. 3. Our ſenſe agrees better with *Beda*, who aſſerts poſitively, that from *Reudas*'s Time, the Scots made a third Nation in the Iſle of *Britain*, with the *Britans* and *Picts*. 4. *Selden*, *l.* 2. *c.* 8. confeſſes, that the *Scoti Pictique*, were

were the *Gentes non ſubjacentes Romano Imperio.*

* *Ammianus* l. 20 *Conſulatu vero* Conſtantii *decies terque* Juliani *in* Britanniis *cum* Scotorum Pictorumque *Gentium ferarum excurſu rupta quiete condicta loca limitibus vicina vaſtarentur, & implicaret formido provincias præteritarum cladium congerie feſſas.*

* *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who wrote about the Year 360, tells us, That the Scots and Picts harraſed the Country. But the Biſhop unjuſtly adds, that then they firſt harraſſed it. But this cannot be, for *Ammianus* ſpeaks of their Fear, as occaſion'd by a Tract of bygon Defeats; and this he elegantly expreſſes by the words, *congerie præteritarum Cladium*; which ſhews, that theſe he ſpeaks of in the 360, were not the firſt of many overthrows that the *Brittains* had got from the Scots and Picts. And ſo our being here, muſt be much ancienter than the 360; which agrees well with the word *aſſueti* in *Eumenius*. And our having fix'd and known Limits, demonſtrates to all who underſtand the Roman Antiquities, that we were then a fix'd and ſetled Nation, in the ſame Iſland with the Roman Provinces of the *Britans*; the Sea, or any part of it, being never ſignified by their word *Limes*.

* *Lib. 2. ad* Jovian.

* St. *Jerome*, in his Epiſtle to *Jovian*, cites *Porphire*, who liv'd in the

the third *Century*, under *Dioclesian*, and so above 200 Years before the 503. His words are, *Neither* Britain *a Province fertil of Tyrants, and the Scotish Nation, and all the Barbarous Nations, dwelling around the Ocean, knew* Moses, *and the Prophets.* By the *Scotish Nations* * *Usher* understands not the *Scythians*, but the *Scots*, because they are in this place joyn'd to *Britain:* but tho both he, and the Bishop of *St. Asaph* would apply this citation to *Ireland*, yet this Gloss is most absurd; for by the former Argument, the word *Scots* should be apply'd to us, for we are join'd to *Britain*; but *Ireland* is no more join'd to *Britain*, than *Scythia.* And the same *Jerome*, in the next Citation, calls the Scots a Nation of *Britain*; where he says, * That *when he was young, he saw the Scots, a Nation of* Britain, *feed upon Mans Flesh.* From which it is clear, that the Scots at that time dwelt in *Britain*, which agrees very well with *Beda*, who calls the Scots the third *Britannick Nation.* And *Selden* calls the Scots and Picts, *Gentes Britannicas*, l. 2. c. 8. And this

* C. 15. p. 728. *de Primord.*

* *Quid loquar de cæteris nationibus, cum ipse adolescentulis in* Gallia, Scotos *Gentem* Britannicam *humanis vesci carnibus. Vidi* l. 2. *ad* Jov. † Pref. L. in Iren.

is further clear'd, by his aſſerting, that *Pelagius* was of a Scotiſh Race, in the Neighbour-head of *Britain*; which proves clearly, as the learn'd * *Baronius* obſerves, that there were Scots then in *Britain*, who were Chriſtians, elſe how could they have been *Pelagians?* Nor can this eating Man's Fleſh, be thought any juſt reflection on the Nation; for certainly theſe had been ſome Rogues, who had fled out of the Nation, becauſe they knew they would have been puniſh'd for this Crime. Nor can their eating Man's Fleſh in *France* be charg'd on us, but on the French, where this is ſaid to be ſo publickly done, that St. *Jerome* could have ſeen it; and there is no Hiſtorian that ever charg'd this on our Nation, nor any part of the Iſle, even in our moſt barbarous Times. And if it had been any ways common, there would have been a Law made againſt it. And *Boethius* relates, that there was one mean Man guilty of it, who was thereupon executed examplarly. And in what Nation are there not ſome Monſters?

* Tom. 5. p. 537.

Ano-

Another of the Reverend * Fathers of the Primitive Church, enumerating the Nations, which were deſcended from *Japhet*, mentions the *Britons* and *Scots*, whoſe Iſle is *Britain*. This ſhews, that there were Scots living in *Britain* in *Epiphanius*'s Time, and ſo he proves not only our Antiquity, by his own Authority, but confirms and explains what was formerly urg'd from *Jerome*, in whoſe Time he liv'd, and to whom he wrote Letters.

* Epiphanius *in auchorato.* P. 117. *ad par.* Britanni, Scoti, *quorum inſula eſt* Britannia.

* *Oroſius*, who in *Anno* 417, ſays, That *Severus thought fit to ſecure that part of the Iſle which he had, by a Wall, from the other unconquered Nations.* And that We, and the Picts were theſe unconquered Nations, appears from * *Beda*, wherein he deſcribes thoſe very Actions, in thoſe very words. And all theſe Authors agreeing with *Beda*, and writing of the Times wherein themſelves liv'd, are ſufficient Teſtimonies, according to the Biſhop's own ſtricteſt Rules. And they prove how unkind the Biſhop is in leſſening *Beda*'s Teſtimony, when it makes for us; by ſaying, he ſpoke

* *Receptam partem inſulæ à cæteris indomitis gentibus vallo diſtinguendam putavit.*

* Cap. 5, & 12.

then according to the Times wherein theſe Actions happn'd: for we ſee, that they who wrote, and liv'd in the Time of thoſe Actions, agree fully with him, as they ſpeak clearly for us.

SECT. 6. Proofs from Reaſon.

Having thus made plain the Antiquity of our Kings and Nation from the Hiſtorians both within and without the Iſle. I now proceed to clear theſe from the Principles of ſound Reaſon: As to which, let us conſider, That it being acknowledg'd by *Uſher*, and the Authors he cites, that *Ireland* was peopl'd by the Scots, before *Julius Cæſar*'s Time; and by their own Authors, whom that Biſhop cites, they are ſaid to have been ſo anciently there, that we do not know how many Ages they poſſeſs'd that Iſle before *Julius Cæſar*. And they being a very broody People, as all Northen Nations, and particularly they, and we are, could not but have multiply'd ſo exceedingly, as to need relief, and evacuation by Colonies. And it can never be pretended, that the Iriſh did ſettle any other Colony

ny ſave in *Britain*: though it be undenyable, that all thoſe Northen Nations were very deſirous and concern'd to extend, by Colonies, the Empire of their whole Nation, and thereby the Poſſeſſion and Property of every particular Man in it. Nor do we ever read, that the Iriſh had any Wars with Strangers, whereby they might have either wanted Men to ſend into Foreign Colonies, or have been forc'd to keep them at home, for their own defence. Whether then are our Hiſtories more probable, which make this Colony to have come over before *Julius Cæſar*? or the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*'s account, who makes us not to have ſettl'd here, till 503 Years after Chriſt. And tho I eſteem the Iriſh, yet I muſt remark, that our humour differs ſo much from theirs, that it may from thence appear, that we ſtay'd not long amongſt them, but that we came from thence very early.

2. By all the tract of the *Roman* Hiſtories, as well as by *Beda*'s, *Gildas*'s and ours, it is clear, that the Scots and Picts fought joyntly a-

gainſt the Romans in this Country which we now poſſeſs: That the Walls built by *Adrian*, and *Severus*, were built here, to defend them againſt them: That Complaints were made to the *Romans* by the *Britons* of them, and that Succours were crav'd againſt them: That the *Saxons* were call'd in, to defend the *Britons*, from the Scotiſh and Pictiſh Incurſions: That they were call'd jointly, *unconquer'd Nations*. All which points prove, that they were equal in every thing; and why not then in their being equally ſettl'd here? And therefore, except it were clearly prov'd that the Scots were not ſettl'd and fix'd here, as the Picts were; and that there were Authors produc'd, who living in theſe Times, declar'd, that in the Year 503, the Scots were firſt call'd to defend the Picts, as the *Saxons* are clearly prov'd to have been call'd in, againſt the Scots, and Picts, in the Year 449, very near to the Year 503; which is ſaid by the Biſhop to be our Entry: It muſt be neceſſarily concluded, that the Scots were here at the time, wherein all theſe things are told of them

them joyntly, with the *Picts*.

The third Argument ſhall be, that it's undeniable, that the *Scots* and *Picts* were ſuch conſtant and formidable Enemies, that the *Romans*, and *Britans*, who then poſſeſt the Southern part of this Iſle, were forc'd to build two Fences againſt them: The firſt betwixt *Tyne* and *Solloway*, which was call'd *Adrian's Wall*: And the ſecond, by *Severus*, who having enlarg'd the *Roman* Conqueſt, built a ſecond, betwixt *Forth* and *Clyde*, and called it by his own name. How then can it be imagin'd, that the Scots did not live on the other ſide of that Wall? for if they had liv'd in *Ireland*, the Wall had not been neceſſary, or uſeful, againſt them. This common ſenſe would declare to a Stranger, upon firſt reading the Story; and much more ought it to be believ'd, if we conſider, that if the Scots came from *Ireland*, in *Corroughs*, as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* alledges, from *Gildas*; then they might have landed upon the *Britons* ſide of the Wall; nay, and which is more, they could not conveniently

have landed on the other ſide, except they had gone too far about, and croſs'd a very broad and dangerous Sea.

4. Tho People come once, or twice, from a Foreign Nation, by Sea, to rob and pillage, yet it is againſt ſenſe to think, that for many hundreds of Years, the *Iriſh* would have come over, to make War againſt ſuch powerful Enemies, and return once a Year. And it appers clearly, that this was a conſtant War, from before *Julius Cæſar*'s Time, for above 600 Years: and in thoſe Ages, it is known, that there were not very convenient means fall'n upon, for tranſporting Men, much leſſe Armies; they having only *Corroughs*, as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* himſelf acknowledges: And theſe are a miſerable little kind of ſhapeleſs Boats, made of Leather, ſtreatch upon Timber, as we find them, and the *Iriſh* Sea, deſcrib'd by * *Solinus*, who liv'd near thoſe Times, and writes, that *Mare quod* Iuvernam *&* Britanniam *interfluit, undoſum & inquietum toto in anno, niſi aſtivis pauculis die-*

* Pag. 352.

bus,

bus, eſt navigabile: navigant autem viminiis alviis, quos circumdant ambitu tergorum bubulorum. And how theſe could tranſport an Army every Year to fight againſt ſuch powerful Enemies as the *Romans* and *Britons?* And how they could carry back in them the great Booty worthy to be fought for? eſpecially over ſuch broken Seas, that are yet terrible in the beſt Seaſon, to the beſt of our Boats, and the ſtouteſt of Seamen, is left to be conſidered by Men judicious, or diſintereſted in any meaſure: Eſpecially, ſeeing they behov'd to return in the Winter-time, for it's preſum'd, they fought all Summer; and even then, they had not the chuſing of their own fair Weather, but had juſt reaſon to be afraid that they would be chas'd away, as Robbers uſually are; and as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* aſſerts they often-times were. But as all this is abſurd, and incredible, according to the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*'s Hypotheſis; ſo it is moſt conſiſtent with ours; in which we aſſert, that the Scots ſetled on the other ſide of *Clyde*, from which they might come every

every Year; which agrees alſo well with *Beda*'s ſaying, That the Scots ſetled *ad partem ſeptentrionalem ſinus Acluith*, or *Dumbriton*; a narrow Sea, and call'd one part of the *Mare Scoticum* by the Engliſh Authors, and particularly by * *Holinſhed*, and † *Polidore*, as by our ‖ *Major*; and was ſo deſign'd in the forms of holding Circuits, as is clear by the 4 Chap. of the Laws of King *Malcom* 2. and by 5*th*. Act P. 3. *J*. 2*d*. And ſince in the ſaid Laws of *Malcom* 2. who reign'd *Anno* 1004. The Frith of *Forth* is call'd *Mare Scotiæ*, the *Sea of Scotland*, and that is mention'd as a Law in old obſervance; it muſt be concluded, that this Country where we live, was call'd *Scotland*, long before the Year 1000, as Biſhop *Uſher* aſſerts. For ſince *Tacitus* and *Beda* ſay, That we were inclos'd by that Sea, and the Wall, as in an Iſle; it ſeems that this was call'd the Sea of *Scotland* then, it being our March at that time. Nor are theſe Friths improperly call'd Seas, being 40 miles broad in ſome places. And this alſo agrees with our being *tranſmarini*, or on the other ſide of the Sea,

* Pag. 16. *deſc.* Brit.
† *In initio.*
‖ Pag. 6.

Sea, (which are the words us'd in the ſaid Statute) but not out of the Iſle; and it is ſtrange, that the *Viſigoths* ſhould have ſetled in *France* and *Spain*; the *Oſtrogoths* in *Italy*, ſhortly after they had made their inroads; and yet we ſhould have return'd yearly for above 600 Years, notwithſtanding of the former difficulty.

4*ly*, The Scots coming over to this Iſle, could not but know, that the ſouthern Parts of it were very rich, and the People there very cowardly, even to admiration; as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* himſelf relates, from all their Hiſtorians: and there was place enough for a Colony of them in this Iſle, or elſe how could they have planted themſelves after, when the Picts became more numerous; and both the Scots and the Picts had good reaſon to expect every Year new additions of Land: and it is probable, that our Anceſtors, being a Colony of a more ſouthern Nation, ſtrangers in *Ireland*, and but lately ſetled there, left their confinement in the Iriſh Iſle as ſoon as they could, to inlarge

their

their Victories and Poſſeſſions in this larger one, which afforded greater Glory. How then can it be imagin'd, that they would not have ſetled a Colony here, which was far leſs dangerous, and more noble and advantageous, than to be conſtantly robbing for ſmall Booty, to the danger of their Lives? But that they fought for Land, and not for Booty, is very clear; not only from the practice of others, but from *Sabellicus*, * *gliſcere indies id malum augebatur duarum gentium audaciâ: apparebatq; brevi totam inſulam alienatam iri, niſi ejuſmodi conatibus maturé iretur obviam.*

* *Æneid.* l. 9. c. 1.

5. How it is imaginable, that the Picts (finding themſelves in ſo great danger from the Romans and Britons, the one very conſiderable for their Valour, and the other for their great Numbers) would not have intreated the Scots to ſtay conſtantly with them? for tho they had been equal to their Enemies, when the Scots and they were together, yet they could not be but much more inferiour to them, when the Scots left them once every Year.

6. If

6. If the Iriſh had conſtantly ſent in Auxiliaries to aſſiſt againſt the Romans, it is not to be believ'd but the Romans would have reſented this Injury againſt the Kingdom of *Ireland*; which they never did, except once, * when the Iriſh gave the Scots Supplies, endeavouring to re-eſtabliſh themſelves after the expulſion of *Eugenius*. And if this War had been carried on by the Kingdom of *Ireland*, and not by the Scots in *Scotland*; we had certainly heard, that the Kings of *Ireland* had been mention'd, both in the Roman, Engliſh, and our Hiſtories: for it is not to be imagin'd, that ſo long, and ſo great Wars could have been carried on by the Subjects, without the conſent of the King and Kingdom.

* Buchan. p. 128.

7. If they never had been call'd in by the Picts, to ſtay as a Colony, till the Saxons had beat the Britons, who had lately call'd them in to their Aſſiſtance: How is it imaginable to think, that the Picts would have call'd them in as Auxiliaries at that time? having ſo lately

ly ſeen, how dangerous Auxiliaries might prove, eſpecially conſidering, that the Scots had been us'd many hundred Years to robbing, as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* would have us believe; and that they were part of a numerous near Nation, from whom they might expect ſuddenly great Supply: or that they would have not only run this riſque, but have divided with them their little Country; and yet not have employ'd their Aſſiſtance for the Ends for which they call'd them in. For the Biſhop* tells us, that the Scots did nothing for 100 Years after they were call'd in.

* Pag. 37.

8. It cannot be deny'd, but that about the Year 792, * there was a League entred into betwixt *Charles the Great*, call'd *Charle-Maigne* King of *France*, and Emperor of the Weſt, and *Achaius* King of *Scotland*, call'd by all the French Hiſtorians, the *Famous Alliance*. In which the King of *Scotland* did ſend over 4000 Men to the aſſiſtance of *Charles the Great*. And this is teſtified by *Ægi-*

* *Chambers* particularly, *p.* 9, & 96; alſo from *p.* 229 to the end of the Treatiſe.

* *Æginardus* who wrote the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, and was Secretary to *Charles the Great*; and who is cited by *Uſher*, at which time the King of *Scotland* ſent over very many famous learn'd Men, who founded the incomparable Univerſity of *Paris*. All which is clear by † *Favin*, in his *Theatre of Honour*; and || *Paulus Æmilius* in that King's Life. From which I raiſe two Arguments; 1. How can it be imagin'd, that if the Scots had not ſetled in a Colony till the 503, that their King could have been ſo famous, that in about 280 Years time, this ſmall Colony, which the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* repreſents to have been

* *Scotorum quoque reges ſic habuit ad ſuam voluntatem, per ſuam munificentiam inclinatos, ut eum nunquam aliter quam dominum pronunciarent: extant epiſtolæ ab iis ad eum miſſæ, quibus hujuſmodi affectus eorum erga illum judicatur.* Æginard. *vita Caroli magni ad annum* 791.

† Lib. 5. pag. 80. *Æginard.* Secretary to *Charlemaigne*, maketh an enumeration of ſtrange Princes, who imbrac'd the Amity of that puiſſant Monarch. The Emperors of *Conſtantinople*, *Perſia*; the Kings of *India* and *Gallicia*, with the Kings of *Scotland*. *Favin.* l. 5. p. 8. The Scots joyful of this Alliance, as the moſt famous in Chriſtendom, delegated for their Ambaſſours, *William* Brother to their King *Achatus*, aſſiſted with the counſel of four Perſons, renown'd for Learning, *Clemens*, *Joannes*, *Rabanus*, and *Alcuinus*, with 4000 Men of War ſent to the ſuccour of *Charle-maigne*. The two worthy Doctors who ſtaid with *Charle-maign* at *Paris* and *Padua*, were *John* ſirnam'd *Scotus*, a Scottiſh-man, both by Nation and Sirname, and *Claudius Clemens*.

|| Paulus Æmilius *in vita* Caroli magni. *Cæterum ut paulatim extingueret* Saxonum *nomen*; *honores magiſtratuſque gentibus alieginis & in primis* Scotis *mandabat, quorum egregia fide virtuteq; utebatur.*

but

but *pilfering barbarous Robbers*, would have become ſo famous, that *Charles the Great*, then Emperor of all the Weſtern World, would have entred into a League with them, eſpecially ſince they had not for 100 Years after their ſettlement, done any memorable Action, * as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* alledges? 2. If our Kings, and Nation, had only then *Dalrieda*, or the Kingdom of *Argile*, as the Biſhop contends, how could this Prince of *Argile* (which is, after all improvement but an Earldom) have been worthy, not only of the Alliance of the great Emperor of the Weſt, but to be able to ſend 4000 Men, eſpecially having ſuch dangerous Enemies at Home, and being himſelf but a Stranger, newly entred into a Foreign Iſland, and living in a ſmall part of the Iſle, with the Picts, the more powerful and ancient poſſeſſors. And that there were 4000 Men ſent by virtue of that League, is clear, not only from *Verimundus*, out of whoſe 2*d* Book *Chambers* cites the whole League; but by *Sanſovin* an Italian, who writes the Hiſtory of the *Douglaſſii*, or *Scoti*, whom he derives

*Pag. 34, & 38.

Vid. *Sanſovino. delle origine delle Caſe illuſtri d' Italici.* p. 111. *Edit. in* 4o. *An.* 1609.

derives from *William Douglas*, who was Lieutenant at that Time to Prince *William*, Brother to *Achaius*. For which *Sanſovin* cites another, *viz. Umberto Locato*, more ancient than himſelf. * And this is ſo far acknowledg'd by the French Kings, that upon it we got very great Privileges in *France*, and all the Heraulds in *Europe* acknowledg, that the double *Treſſure*, was the Badg of that Alliance.

* *Nella Cronica di piacenza.*

9. How can it be conceiv'd, that the Scots could in ſo ſhort a time, after their Settlement, have been able, without any help, to extirpate the Picts, who muſt be preſum'd to have been very ſtrong, having been ſo long ſetled in this Iſle; and having poſſeſt in effect all that we have now, benorth *Forth*, except the Shire of *Argyle*, if we believe the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*.

Our Tradition is fortified, and the former Authorities cited by us, are clear'd, from the receiv'd Laws of our Nation; for firſt, all our Hiſtories bear, * That *after King* Fergus's *death, the Nobility finding his Son too young, and the Wars in which they*

* *Leſl.* pag. 80. *Buchan.* p. 97.

were engaged very dangerous; they declared, that the Uncle ſhould govern. Which Cuſtom continu'd, till it occaſion'd many bloody Civil Wars betwixt the Uncles and Nephews: and therefore * was juſtly abrogated by a Parliament holden by *Kenneth* the Third, which *Kenneth* the Third reign'd, *Anno* 970. And it were very ridiculous to think, that ſince theſe Matters of Fact are true, *viz.* That there were bloody Civil Wars betwixt the Uncles and the Nephews; and that all this hath been much debated in poſterior Parliaments, betwixt ſuch as were for the Crown, and ſuch as were for popular Elections; without ever controverting the Truth of the Matter of Fact; and long before we could have any apprehenſion of ſuch a debate as this, and ſo that all this was a meer fiction, calculated for maintaining an Antiquity, which was never controverted.

* *Leſl.* p. 188. *Buchan.* p. 190.

It can as little be deny'd, that there were Laws relating to the *merchetæ mulierum*; ſince many of our old Charters relate to them, and diſcharges of them are incorporated in

in our Charters; and which Styles are a part of our old and Traditional Law: Theſe *merchetæ mulierum* were thereafter abrogated by King *Malcom Canmor*'s Laws, many hundred Years before the ſtarting of this Debate: And that there were ſuch Laws, is alſo acknowledged, not only by *Baker*, and others within the Iſle, but even by *Solinus* and *Jerome*, &c. * And that theſe Laws were made by *Evenus* the Third, who liv'd twelve Years before Chriſt, is a part of the ſame Tradition; and ſo cannot but be believ'd, ſince Laws are one of the probableſt Means imaginable, for preſerving Tradition. By the Laws likewiſe of *Malcom* the 2*d*, who reign'd in the Year 1004. The Frith of *Forth* is call'd *Mare Scotiæ*, or the Sea of *Scotland*; which demonſtrates, that before the Year 1000, our Country was call'd *Scotia*, or *Scotland*: and confirms and clears all that is ſaid out of *Beda*; and as this deſignation of the Scotiſh Sea is look'd upon there, as a thing very old and acknowledg'd; ſo it is continu'd in our Laws for many Ages, as is

* Lib. 2. ad *Jovianum*, who ſeems to point at this, when he ſays, that *Scoti nullas proprias habens uxoret.*

* *Solin.* cap. 25. *de* Britannia.

evident by *K. J. 2d*, his Laws above-cited.

I had reſolved not to mention the Biſhop's Objections, againſt our early Converſion: But I find it ſo clear, that we were converted to the Chriſtian Faith before the Year 503, that there reſults this concluding Argument from it, to prove that we were ſetled before that time. For if we were a Chriſtian Nation converted here, before that time; it follows neceſſarily, that we were a Nation ſetled here before that Time: Since a Nation is ſaid no where to be converted, but where it is ſetled, albeit ſome Perſons of that Nation may be ſaid to be converted abroad. And that this part of the Iſle which we now inhabit, and that people from which we are deſcended, were Chriſtians before that time; ſeems to me very evident, from the former teſtimony of *Tertullian*, who wrote in the end of the ſecond Century, to which I refer my Reader: And tho *Tertullian* liv'd a little before King *Donald*, yet the Anſwer is apparent, *viz.* that the Nations were ordinarily converted before

before the Kings or Magiſtrates. And it's indeed very probable that the *Chriſtians* who were perſecuted in the Southern Nations, would flee from their Perſecutors, the *Roman* Emperours: And where could they ſeek refuge ſo reaſonably, as in that Country, and amongſt that People which had never ſubmitted to the Roman Empire? And it being acknowledg'd by the learn'd *Uſher*, and my Lord St. *Aſaph*, that *Britain* was converted in the firſt Century; it is very reaſonable to think, that the Chriſtians, who had fled to this Iſle, from the perſecution of the Romans, would have very probably ſhelter'd themſelves here, where the Romans had no power: for though it be not prov'd, that the Roman Perſecution reach'd to *Britain* ſo early; yet certainly they who fled ſo far from the Perſecution, would not think themſelves very ſecure within the Dominions of the Perſecutors, and would have ſecured themſelves by a few more Miles from ſo dreaded a danger. As alſo, it ſeems very improbable, that ſince the Chriſtian Religion ſpread from *Jeruſalem* to *Britain* in

leſs than 100 Years, that it would have taken above 300 Years more, to reach ſo few Miles, as are betwixt the Britiſh part of the Iſle, and *Scotland*. It is alſo preſumable that the *Druids* having been ſo prepared to receive Chriſtianity, by their excellent Principles of *Philoſophy*, and their *ſeverity of Life formerly mentioned, which did not contradict*, but illuminate the Chriſtian Doctrine, they would have both been eaſie to be converted themſelves, and ready to have converted their former Diſciples, and the People who admir'd them. I might here cite many Authors; but I fix upon * *Beda*, who aſſerts poſitively, That *Palladius* was ſent in the 8*th* Year of *Theodoſius junior*; that is to ſay, in the 431 *ad Scotos in Chriſtum credentes*, by Pope *Cæleſtine*, as their firſt Biſhop: And that *Beda* wrote of us, as the Scots, is formerly prov'd; and this Miſſion of *Palladius* falling in the Tract and Series of the Actions aſcrib'd by *Beda* to us only, it is inconſiſtent with common Reaſon, that the things before and after, and the things related in the very Chapter,

* Lib. 1. c. 13.

ter, ſhould be only applicable to us, and yet only this ſhould not: albeit our own and Foreign Hiſtories apply the ſame to us. As to Foreign Hiſtories, I ſhall only cite *Baronius*, who, becauſe he made *Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory* more his buſineſs than my Lord St. *Aſaph*, and was more diſintereſted, is therefore more to be believ'd as to this point.

This great Antiquary * tells, *That the Scots who had firſt receiv'd the* Chriſtian Faith *from Pope* Victor, *and their firſt* Biſhop *from Pope* Cæleſtine, *were become the chief of all* Chriſtians, *from being amongſt the moſt barbarous of all Nations*, having formerly ſaid, † That *all conſent that* Palladius *was their firſt* Biſhop; and for which he cites *Proſper*, as he does *Tertullian*, *Jerome*, *Sedulius*, and others, for our being *Chriſtians* under Pope *Victor*, ſaying, That || *they are not to be refuted who aſſert our converſion under Pope* Victor: but is moſt poſitive as to *Palladius*. And whereas it is * pretended that *Proſper's* words are not applicable to us, ſince he ſays, that *Palladius made*

* Tom. 5. edit. col. p. 586, & 589. num. 5. *Qui igitur Evangelium primo à* victore *Pontifice maximo accepere, & à* Celeſtino Papa *primum* Epiſcopum, *à quo ſunt omnes penitus redditi Chriſtiani, eatenus Chriſti gratia profecere, qui olim gentilitio ritu viventes, ob ferinos mores, ut portentum oſtentui erant humano generi præſtantiſſimi evenerint Chriſtiani*, &c.

† Num. 4.

|| *Quia* Victore Romano Pontifice, Scotos *evangelium accepiſſe, majorum traditione ſcripſere, haud ſunt refellendi.*

* Uſher, *p.* 798 *de prim.*

the barbarous Island Christian; *and our* Scotland *is not an Island.*

To this it is answer'd, That our part of *Britain* was by *Tacitus*, and *Beda*, said to be reduc'd into an Island, by the *Roman* Wall from Sea to Sea: and * *Beda* in other places of his History calls us therefore *Islanders*. *Baronius* also applies this to us, and so this gloss is to be preferr'd, to that unwarrantable gloss or reading cited by the Bishop of St. *Asaph*, from the copy of a Manuscript of *Nenius*, *Missus est* Palladius Episcopus, *primitus à Cœlestino ad Scotos in Christum convertendos:* for that not only differs from *Beda*, the far more learn'd, ancient, and credible Author: But it is improbable to say, that a Bishop was sent to those, which were to be converted, seeing Conversion useth to be by Presbyters, and Missionars; and when the Church is gather'd, the Bishop is sent: and this gloss contradicts not only common sense, but * *Ado Viennen*, and * *Marian*, *who both use Beda's own words*, *Ad* Scotos in Christum *credentes:* and what is said of the conversion

* Lib. 1. c. 12. *ac Tusculani*, &c. L. 4. c. 26. *Eccl.*

* Stat. 6.

* Pag. 340.

converſion of the Scots and Picts by St. *Ninian*, *Palladius*, and *Columba*, to make our converſion to be later than *Tertullian* made it, *viz.* in the 2*d* Century, muſt be interpreted of our fuller and ſounder converſion from Paganiſm, and Pelagianiſm; and of our being conform'd to the Romiſh Church, and Rites, which the Authors of thoſe Times conſidered as the only true converſion. But to make this our firſt converſion, were to contradict *Tertullian*, *Jerome*, the learn'd *Baronius*, as well as all our Hiſtores. And the * *Magdeburgian Centuriators* do poſitively agree with *Baronius*, and our Hiſtory, in this our Antiquity: and ſo having for us the greateſt Eccleſiaſtick Antiquaries, both Proteſtant and Papiſt, we need not condeſcend upon particular Authors: theſe being the Standards of Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtory to the Profeſſors of both Religions: and it is ſtrange after all this, that a Church-man ſhould ſo poſitively contradict, what the Antiquaries of both Churches have ſo poſitively aſſerted; tho if there had been any thing, wherein they could

* *Edit. Baſil.* 1624. 2*d. Cent.* p. 1.

could have contradicted one another, they would certainly have differ'd.

That *Donald* then was our first Christian King, in *Anno* 203, and *Palladius* our first Bishop, in *Anno* 431, seems most fully prov'd: for these being Matters of Fact, may be prov'd by Witnesses; and who are better Witnesses, than the many Historians of the Country where the things were transacted; especially since these were Matters of great importance, and Notoriety; which the Monasteries, whose Faith is followed by our Historians, could not but know best of all others, and in which they durst not cheat or forge, because the Annals of other Churches would have contradicted them, whereas they are confirm'd by them; and these things fell out, when we had the help of Letters, and are agreeable to the sound Reasons above-related: Tho the conversion of a Kingdom be a matter that could not be unknown, and no other King but *Donald* was ever recorded to have been the first Christian King here.

That

That *Palladius* was ſent to the Scots in *Britain*, and not to the Scots in *Ireland*, appears further from theſe undeniable matters of Fact; *viz.* That *Pope Cæleſtine* did ordain, and ſend *Palladius*, in Anno 431: That the ſame *Pope Cæleſtine* ſent *St. Patrick* to *Ireland*: That *St. Patrick*'s Miſſion muſt have been before the *6th* of *April* 432, is alſo clear, becauſe *Proſper* tells, that *Cæleſtine* died that Year. And the *Roman Pontifical* tells, it was on the *6th* of *April* that Year. From all which, the *Biſhop* did ſee that *Palladius*'s miſſion muſt have been to the *Scots* in *Scotland*; elſe *Palladius* had been firſt Biſhop of *Ireland*, and St. *Patrick* needed not have been ſent into *Ireland*, ſince *Palladius* was ſent there but the Year before. To reconcile which real Contradictions, the Bp of St. *Aſaph* makes up a laborious *Hypotheſis*, and ſay's, that *Palladius* was indeed in *Ireland*, but finding he could not ſucceed, he was upon his return to *Rome*, but died in, or near the bounds of the *Picts*, the 15*th* of *December*, 431. So that St. *Patrick*, who liv'd in *Britain*, could not but have

have known his death, and had time enough to go to *Rome*, and be ordain'd Biſhop for *Ireland*, and go to that *Kingdom*, and there finiſh their Converſion, which *Palladius* had only begun: and ſo St. *Patrick* was call'd the firſt Biſhop. All this Hypotheſis is almoſt impoſſible, though good *Palladius* had ſooner, and deeplier deſpair'd, than a Saint ſhould have done, eſpecially in the Converſion of a whole Nation: and though both had poſted faſter for a Benefice, than Holy-Church-men did in thoſe Primitive Times. Yet all this is founded upon *Palladius*'s having died *Decemb.* 15. 431. And the only proofs produc'd for this by my Lord St. *Aſaph*, is *Baleus de* 14. *ſcrip.* 6. near the end; and yet in that ſame Citation it is poſitively ſaid, that *Palladius* was ſent to *Scotland*, and the particular Scotiſh King is nam'd; and *Baleus* adds, That *Palladius claruit Anno virginei partus*, 434; *he flouriſh'd in the Year* 434, and ſo he died not in the 431. And not content with this, *Baleus* goes on, telling, that *poſt multos pios tandem ſudores & religioſa exercitia*

citia

citia in Fordono *vico* Merniæ *fælicem hujus vitæ ſortius eſt exitum.* Which is in our *Scotland*, and in the North part thereof, very far out of the Road from *Ireland* to *Rome*; and where we have St. *Padies Church* and *Fair*; and with us he is nam'd our firſt Biſhop to this day: but was never nam'd an Iriſh Biſhop, until the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* made him by a ſtrange word firſt, *in omination of ſucceſs*, as he ſays, tho not he, but St. *Patrick* had this ſucceſs. If then he died not ſo ſoon, and if the time of his death is not prov'd, why might he not have baptiz'd *Tarvanus*? And why ſhould our *Boethius* be hector'd for ſaying, that *Palladius* baptiz'd *Tarvan*? Yet I impute not this to my Lord St. *Aſaph*'s miſtake or ignorance; but it is an elaborate contrivance, to divert all the unanſwerable Authorities, proving that *Palladius* was ſent to us in *Scotland*, in the Year 431, and ſo before the Year 503, in which my Lord St. *Aſaph* ſays we ſetled firſt in *Britain*. I ſhall conclude this concerning *Palladius*, with the ſuffrage of Dr. *Hammond*, a learn'd and Epiſcopal Engliſh Divine, who

* Pag. 162. * who in his *vindication of the diſſertations concerning Epiſcopacy*, reconciling the ſeeming Differences between *Beda*, who aſſerts, that *Palladius was ſent to the Scots believing in Chriſt*: And *Proſper*, who ſpeaking of the ſame Miſſion, ſays, That *Palladius made alſo the Barbarous Iſland Chriſtian*; lays down theſe three Concluſions; 1. That Chriſtianity was planted in *Scotland*, before *Cæleſtine*'s Time, deriv'd to them moſt probably from their Neighbour *Britons* here, with whom they are known to have agreed in the keeping of *Eaſter*, contrary to the Cuſtom of the Roman Church, as * *Beda* ſays. 2. That this Plantation was very imperfect, differing little from Barbariſm, and ſo reputed by *Proſper*, till the coming of Biſhop *Palladius* among them. 3. That even after that, they retain'd the uſe of *Eaſter*, contrary to the *Roman* cuſtome, which ſtill refers to ſome rude converſion of theirs before *Palladius*; and ſo it is evident, that in the learn'd *Doctor*'s opinion, the *Scotland* to which *Palladius* was ſent, was ours; and that we were *Chriſtians* before his coming,

* Lib. 3.

coming, tho rude and barbarous. The Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* having thus ſpirited from us, into *Ireland*, *Palladius* our firſt Biſhop, he proceeds to tranſlate *Amphibalus* our firſt Churchman upon Record, unto a Shag-Cloak; deſigning likewiſe thereby to prove, that *Boethius* our Hiſtorian is not to be credited, becauſe he follow'd their fabulous *Jeffrey*: Who finding that St. *Alban* had, to ſave his pious Gueſt, taken the holy Man's Habit, to the end he might be martyr'd for him; and as *Beda* expreſſes it, *Caracalla ejus indutus*; *Jeffrey* concludes, as my Lord St. *Aſaph* alledges, that the Veſtiment was *Amphibalus*; and *Jeffrey* having made the Cloak a Man, *Boetius* made him a Biſhop of the *Iſle of Man*: and ſo this Cloak was fitly ordain'd to be a proper Biſhop for the Chapter of the *Culdees*: But this is *ludere in ſacris*, and to expoſe Epiſcopacy it ſelf upon the Stage. In anſwer to which, I ſhall only offer theſe few thoughts, Firſt, What Intereſt had *Jeffrey* (who was a *Briton*) to oblige the Scots, or the *Iſle of Man*, in making ſo horrid a lye? 2. It is againſt ſenſe,

to

to think that any Man, much leſs a Scholar, could have been ſo groſs, as to take a Shag Cloak for a Biſhop. 3. If the Shag Cloak had been miſtaken for the name of a Man, he ſhould have been call'd *Caracalla*, and not *Amphibalus*; for the *Legend* being written in Latin, *Jeffrey* had certainly choſen the word *Caracalla*, becauſe that was the Latin word, and was the word uſed by *Beda*, and becauſe there was a Roman Emperor truly of that name, before *Beda* and *Jeffrey*'s Time. 4. *Beda* relating to that paſſage, tells us, that in the *Dioclesian* Perſecution, St. *Alban*, *Aron*, *Julius*, and many others ſuffer'd: And why might not *Amphibalus* be one of theſe many that ſuffer'd? And why ought *Boethius* to have been tax'd, for mentioning *Amphibalus*, ſince this was done long before him, by a multitude of Engliſh Writers, cited by Biſhop *Uſher*, who deriv'd his birth from *Greece*, and deſcribes the particular Actions of his Life, and his Martyrdom; with which alſo the modern Engliſh Writers agree, as * *Baleus*, *Holinſhed*, *Speed*, all which Engliſh, and thouſands of other

*Pag. 28, & 58.

other Teſtimonies do far weigh down Biſhop *Uſher*'s Conjectures, that *Amphibalus* was not a Man, but a Veſtiment, from the ſilence of *Gildas*, *Beda*, the Martyrologies and Breviaries of *Salisbury*, and *Jeffrey*, who do not mention him: for *Gildas* could not mention him, writing concerning the Conqueſt, and Deſtruction of *Britain*; *Beda* tells the Paſſage relative to St. *Alban*; and albeit he names him not in the Dioclesian Perſecution, yet he tells, that many more ſuffer'd than the three he names. We have not ſeen the Martyrologies, and Breviaries, nor does it import whether they mention him or not; and it is not ſo much to be wondered at, that ſome Engliſh Writers do not mention him, as that he is mention'd by ſo many, ſeeing he was a *Greek*, and a Biſhop in the remote Iſles of *Britain*, and in all likelihood would have been buried under ſilence, had it not been for that Paſſage with St. *Alban*.

My laſt Argument for confirming our Hiſtory, ſhall be, that the beſt Critiques, Hiſtorians, and Antiquaries

tiquaries of other Nations, who had occaſion to mention our Hiſtories, and particularly the great *Baronius*, *Scaliger*, *Salmaſius*, *Lipſius*, *Carolus Sigonius*, *Favinus*, *Selden*, and others of the firſt Rank, (too many to be nam'd) have paſſionately defended our Antiquity, and not only ſuſtain'd, but prais'd our Hiſtories: and ſo the Arguments and Grounds whereupon I have proceeded, are already aſſerted by the beſt Judges, and that too after *Luddus* publiſh'd his Objections againſt the ſame, and almoſt the very ſame Objections which are now urg'd, and which are treated with great contempt by * *Scaliger*. Since then there is nothing now urg'd, that could have eſcaped the obſervation of theſe learn'd and curious Authors, who could not but have diſcover'd, as ſoon as the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, that our Hiſtorians did not mention any Warrants which were written in the Time, or did contradict the Roman Hiſtory or one another. I admire why now theſe our Hiſtories ſhould be controverted. And tho ſomething might be pretended, if my Lord St. *Aſaph* did

* Pag. in *Euſeb.*

in

in this Book, produce Manuſcripts unknown to thoſe learn'd Criticks; yet could they have been ſo blind and ignorant (eſpecially in that ſubtile and laborious Age, wherein all Men were by a noble emulation contending, who ſhould diſcover moſt) as not to have ſeen defects? which if they had been real, they had been obvious. It is alſo very remarkable, that ſince all Nations are emulous of one another in Matters of Antiquity; yet they, by yielding to ours, have thereby acknowledg'd, that ours was beyond all debate; and to this day, none controvert it, (notwithſtanding of all the pains taken by *Luddus*, *Cambden*, and *Uſher*) further than to gratify their own Country. And therefore, as *Cicero* argues, that the Romans were the braveſt, becauſe every Nation commended them next to their own: I may contend, that we are the moſt ancient, becauſe every Nation confeſſes us to be next to themſelves in Antiquity. I ſhall cite, for confirming this, ſome few Inſtances. *Saxo Gram. Swaningius*, *Albertus Krantzius*, own our Name

and Nation to have been before Chriſt, though after the *Danes*. *Mezeray* ſhortly after *Pharamond*: and my Lord St. *Aſaph* himſelf, who brings us in but 50 Years after the Engliſh.

Since it is probable that the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* and I will not agree well in the deciſion of this Debate; were it not juſt that we ſhould both reſt in the deciſion of learn'd Strangers, who underſtood Antiquities exactly, theſe being the ſubject Matter of our Controverſy? And where can we find more qualified Judges than thoſe great Antiquaries whom I have named? But yet to ſhew how much I truſt to the ſtrength of that Truth which I aſſert, I dare appeal to *Selden*, that Engliſh-man, who was ſo affectionate to his Country, and that Antiquary who underſtood beſt of all Mankind the Antiquities of his own Nation, and even to him alſo in his *Mare Clauſum*, written for the Defence and Glory of his Country; who, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. *Maris Clauſi*, has theſe words, ſpeaking of thoſe famous Lines in *Claudian*, to the praiſe of *Stilicho*,

Inde

Inde Caledonio *velata* Britannia *monſtro*
—*Totam cum* Scotus Jernam
Movit & infeſto ſpumavit remige Tethys.

'As the *Palmes*, and the River *Tagus* 'were peculiar to *Spain*, as the Ears 'of Corn and Ivory to *Africa*; ſo 'he would have it underſtood, that 'the Province of *Britain* had the Sea 'of the ſame name peculiar there-'to. But yet it is to be conceiv'd, 'that the Dominion of the Romans 'was ſo limited in this Sea, accord-'ing to their poſſeſſion of the Shore, 'that they had little power in that 'part of the Britiſh Sea, which bor-'dered upon the Shores of thoſe Bri-'tiſh Nations who were not under 'their Obedience. This is to be 'taken chiefly of the Iriſh Sea, and 'the reſt that lies North-weſt; for 'when the Roman Empire began to 'decline, not only in *Ireland*, but 'in the *Iſle of Man* alſo, and the 'other Iſles of the Weſtern Sea, and 'a great portion of the more Nor-'therly parts of *Britain* was poſſeſs'd

'by the Scots and Picts, ſo that we 'have ſufficient ground to conceive, 'that they alſo had an ancient Do- 'minion of their own in the neigh- 'bouring Sea.

From which Paſſage I argue thus,

1. That *Selden* conſider'd the Scots and Picts, as Nations not ſubject to the Romans; *Gentes iis (viz. Romanis) minime ſubjacentes, No manner of way ſubject to the Romans*; and looks on us as the moſt conſiderable of theſe two Nations: for the words run, *A Scotis, tenebatur Pictiſque*; and very juſtly, for we were able to defend them while they were juſt to us, and to extirpate them when they became Enemies.

2. This great Antiquary aſſerts, that the Scots and Picts poſſeſt not only in *Stilicho*'s Time, who was Guardian to *Honorius*, and ſo liv'd about *Anno* 400, a great portion of the Northern part of *Britain*, as well as the Iſle of *Man*, and the reſt of the Weſtern Iſles; and conſequently if we poſſeſt them then, it cannot be ſaid that we were only here

here by way of incurſion, till the Year 500; or were confin'd to *Argile*, till after the Year 500, as my Lord St. *Aſaph* contends.

3. That we were not only poſſeſt then, but that we had *avitum Dominium*, *ancient Dominion*, and had right *priſco jure*; and nothing is ſo inconſiſtent with the being Proprietors, as to be Robbers, coming only by way of Incurſion; and if we had the Dominion of our Seas, *jure priſco*, and *per Dominium avitum*; we were certainly ancient Poſſeſſors before the Year 400, and ſo muſt have been not only far older than the Year 500, but even to have been *priſci incolæ*, as *Beda* (*l.* 1. *c.* 1.) ſays, before the Romans entred this Iſle, and ſo before Chriſt.

Selden alſo, in the tranſition from that 2*d* to the 3*d* Chapter, tells, after that he had ſpoke of the Scots Dominion of their own Sea, that he will treat of the ſucceeding Ages, and ſo proceeds to the Saxons, which demonſtrates, that we were ſetled here before the Saxons, though my Lord St. *Aſaph* makes their ſettlement here more ancient than ours. And in this

Beda agrees with *Selden*, but both contradict the Biſhop. And laſtly, this paſſage clears, that the Teſtimonies, not only of *Claudian* concerning *Jerna*, but even of *Tertullian*, when ſpeaking of the Inhabitants of *Britain* not conquer'd by the Romans, and of *Jerom* ſpeaking of the Britannick Nations, are only applicable to us: And therefore I hope my Lord St. *Aſaph* will not take it ill, if we, in a Matter of Antiquity, prefer an impartial Antiquary, to an intereſted Divine, as I would not be offended, if the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* were preferr'd to me in a Theological Controverſy.

SECT. 7. Anſwers to the Biſhop's Objections.

The firſt general Objection againſt our Hiſtories, is, that they were not written by thoſe who lived in the Time, but more than 1400 Years after the things happened, of which they wrote. And it were ſtrange, that if *Gildas*, who liv'd 500 Years before the eldeſt of them, could find no ſufficient Inſtructions, ſave from Foreigners, that our Hiſtorians ſhould have found ſufficient Warrants for a Hiſtory after ſo long a time.

To

To which my Answer is, That our Histories giving only an account of one Nation, it was easier to find the true and sincere Tradition as to us, than it was in other Nations, where the Conquerors were not concern'd to preserve the Traditions and Records: and though I have made it very probable, that this Isle had the use of Letters before, or at least soon after we settl'd in it, and so might have preserv'd the Story. Yet albeit our History were only founded on Tradition, until about 600 Years after Christ, before which the Monastery of *Jona* or *Icolm-kill* was founded, that Tradition might have been sufficiently preserv'd, for so few Generations, by the means and methods that I have formerly condescended upon. Nor can I see, how the Origin of a Nation could not have been preserv'd by those who were of it, or how, being established it could have vanished when People became more polite and curious. And after the Year 600, I have prov'd, that our Historians might have been, and were sufficiently warranted in what they have said,

by

by old Manuſcripts, and Records: nor is there any thing urg'd in this Objection againſt us, but what might as unanſwerably be urg'd againſt the Greek and Latin Hiſtorians. A receiv'd Hiſtory cannot be overturn'd, from what I have formerly repreſented, without Arguments, which neceſſarily conclude that the Hiſtory impugn'd muſt be falſe; which cannot be alledg'd here, where the Warrants of the Hiſtory controverted, not only might have been, but probably were true; and are ſo far from contradicting other Hiſtories, that they are confirm'd by them.

I deſire alſo to know, what old Manuſcripts and Records *Luddus*, the Antiquary ſo far preferr'd to ours, had for proving, that much elder Succeſſion of Hiſtory from *Brutus* to his own Time: And whereas St. *Aſaph* ſays, that *Buchannan* ſhould not have tax'd *Luddus* for deriving the *Britons* from *Brutus*, ſince he own'd a Succeſſion of our Kings from *Fergus*, there being as few Documents to ſupport the one, as the other.

To

To this my Anſwer is, That there have been very ſolid grounds brought for ſuſtaining the one, which cannot be alledg'd for the other: and ours are adminiculated by the Roman Hiſtory, whereas theirs is inconſiſtent with it: for it is palpably inconſiſtent with the Roman Hiſtory, to ſay, that *Brutus* was the Son of *Aſcanius* whom he kill'd, for which being baniſh'd from *Italy*, he came over to *Britain*: and that *Britain* was govern'd by Conſuls: which ſhould rather be laugh'd at, than confuted.

The Biſhop is moſt unjuſt to us, in aſſerting, that we have no Author of our own before *Fordon*; and that no Author mentions our Antiquity, but ſuch as have follow'd *Fordon*, who wrote about 300 Years ago. For *Fordon* cites his Vouchers, many of which are extant, and thoſe who are loſt, are prov'd to have been extant. Within the Iſle we could have no Authors till there were Writers, and *Gildas* and *Beda*, the eldeſt in the Iſle, prove our Antiquity. Without the Iſle none could know us, being ſo remote, but either

ther by the Wars they had with us, or the Chriſtianity that was common to them and us. As to our Wars, all the *Roman* Authors above-related ſpeak of us; *Oroſius* about the Year 417. *Claudian* 397. *Ammianus* before the Year 360. *Beda* and *Eumenius* ſpeak of us, as before *Julius Cæſar*, as hath been prov'd. All which we have collaterally ſupported, by a gradation of Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtorians abroad, and all our own Hiſtorians at home. *Beda* brings us to *Reutherus*, who was the *6th* King from *Fergus* the firſt: and he living within 150 Years of *Fergus*, this ſhort ſtep may be truſted to Tradition, though we had wanted the help of the *Druids*, and *Phœnician* Letters: for a Father might have inform'd his Son of ſo near a Time; nor was this worthy of a fiction. And I may modeſtly ſay of the foregoing Citations from forraign Authors, that if they be not ſtrong enough to overturn the Biſhop's Hypotheſis, yet they are at leaſt as ſtrong as thoſe produc'd by *Joſephus* in defence of the Jewiſh Hiſtory; and yet all the learn'd World has acquieſc'd in them.

Nor

Nor is there any thing to be concluded from the ſilence of *Adamnanus*, and *Marianus*, the eldeſt of our Hiſtorians: though, as the Biſhop alleadges, they had certainly mention'd our Antiquitiy, if they had known it. For *Adamnanus* wrote no Hiſtory ſave of *Columba*; and *Marianus* going to *Germany*, when he was very young, could know little of us, and mentions only the three Kings of *Scotland*, in whoſe time he liv'd: and ſo if this Argument prov'd any thing, it would prove too much. For certainly we had Kings before thoſe three, whom he mentions; and theſe negative Arguments are of no moment in Matters of Hiſtory, and are juſtly reprobated by the learned *Scaliger*, in his Notes on *Euſebius*, and by * *Voſſius*.

* *De Hiſt. Lat.* p. 4.

The ſecond Objection is, That our Hiſtorians contradict one another concerning the Origin of the Picts; which ought to leſſen their credit. But to this it is anſwered, That our Hiſtorians were not concern'd to conſider the Origin of the Picts as they were to conſider their own

own. And this Objection ſubſumes not what is true in Matter of Fact. For our Hiſtorians generally agree in the Origin of the Picts, whom all of them make to be *Scythians:* and though *Fordon* relates three different accounts of them, yet he does not ſettle upon any thing that is different from our other Hiſtorians * as is fully to be ſeen.

*Cap. 30, & 37. L. 1.

The third Objection is, That our Hiſtorians are contradicted by our own Anteceſſors; for our Hiſtorians aſſert that King *Donald* the firſt was our firſt Chriſtian King; whereas in our Apology againſt *Edward* the firſt of England, about the Year 1300, we aſſert the Tradition of a wonderful Victory obtain'd by our King *Hungus*, againſt the *Saxons*, by the Relicts of St. *Andrew* the Apoſtle, by virtue whereof the Scots firſt receiv'd the Faith of Chriſt.

To which it is ſhortly anſwer'd, that every Contradiction does not overturn the Truth of a whole Hiſtory; otherwiſe we need not be troubled to give any other anſwer to the Biſhop's own Book: nor is this pretended to be a Contradiction amongſt

mongſt our Hiſtorians, for they all agree, that King *Donald* was our firſt Chriſtian King; but in that Apology, which is alledg'd to contradict our Hiſtories, our Predeceſſors deſign'd, as moſt Pleaders do (and this Eloquent Author does in his Book) to gain their Point at any rate. For underſtanding whereof, it is fit to know, that King *Edward* the firſt, having upon the Competition betwixt *Bruce* and *Baliol*, interpos'd with deſign to make himſelf Lord Paramount of *Scotland*; he caus'd his Parliament write to the Pope, to whom afterwards he wrote himſelf; in which Letter of his, it is pretended, that we were Vaſſals to *England*, as deſcended from *Albanactus* the ſecond Son to *Brutus*. 2. Becauſe ſeveral of our Kings had become Vaſſals to his Predeceſſors, in the Times of the Britiſh, Saxon, and Norman Kings. To which we anſwer in our Apology, That without debating, whether the firſt Inhabitants of the Iſle were deſcended from *Albanactus*, or his *Albanians*, it is aſſerted, that we came from *Spain* by *Ireland*, and conquer'd

the

the firſt Inhabitans (for which we cite * *Beda*) and ſo, tho they had been Vaſſals, we were free; not being lyable to the Conditions of the People we conquer'd; and as ſuch, fought conſtantly againſt the *Britons*; who were forc'd to build *Severus*'s Wall againſt us. And as to any homage made by our Kings, it was either for the Three Northen Countries of *Cumberland*, *Weſtmoreland*, and *Northumberland*, confirm'd to us by the *Britons*, to defend them againſt the *Saxons*; and thereafter again * confirm'd by both *Saxons* and *Britons* to aſſiſt them againſt the *Danes*. Or was extorted by force, from one or two young Captive Kings; upon which heads the Popes had declar'd us free: which Bulls, *Edward* himſelf had robb'd unjuſtly out of our Treaſure, with other Records, which he could not deny: but to cajole the Pope their Judg, they inſinuate, that though they were not Tributaries to his Holineſs, as *England* was; yet they ought to be protected by the Pope, becauſe they had been converted by St. *Andrew* his Predeceſſors

* *Bed.* Ec. Hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 1.

* St. *Aſaph*, p. 45.

ſors Brother-german: St. *Andrew* having in *Hungus*'s reign obtain'd for them a Victory over the *Saxons*; and ſo became ſubject, and ſubſervient to the Pope, in having converted the *Saxons* by *Aidan*, *Finan*, and *Colman*. From this Matter of Fact, I obſerve, 1. That we own'd the ſame origination there, that our Hiſtorians do to this day: and ſo our Anceſtors differ'd not from our Hiſtorians, much leſs are they irreconcilable, as St. *Aſaph* alleadges. 2. That the Engliſh acknowledg'd us to be as ancient as the *Britons*, they and we being deſcended from two Brothers. 3. That what we ſaid of St. *Andrew*, muſt needs be upon deſign, to have oblidg'd the Pope, meaning certainly, either that we were then firſt effectually converted to the Church of *Rome*, from the Oriental Obſervations, in which we were very long very obſtinate, and that *Rome* conſider'd that, as the true Converſion; or that after that time we firſt became ſubject, tho not feudatary to the Pope, as theſe forecited words ſubjoyn'd do inſinuate.

But that our converſion from *Paganiſm*, was more than 400 Years before the *Saxons*, is poſitively aſſerted in that ſame Apology. Nor can this have another meaning, for it is undeniable, that we were Chriſtians long before the reign of *Hungus*, who reign'd 800 Years after Chriſt: and *Colman*, &c. liv'd long before that King. Nor was *Hungus* our King, we being only Auxiliaries to him then, as King of the Picts: after which Apology, King *Robert* the 1*ſt* being crown'd, and having defeated King *Edward* at *Banock-burn*, where he gain'd a moſt ſignal Victory over the *Engliſh*, they then being low, made application to the Pope; and he having diſcharg'd us, by a formal Interdiction, to purſue the Victory into *England*; the *Nobility*, to pacify that Pope, and to remove the Interdiction, at the deſire of the King, wrote Letter, wherein they own the Antiquity of our Nation, and Religion, and *Royal-Line*, mentioning when we came from *Spain*, as our Hiſtorians do, with whom they agree exactly, *Ut ex antiquorum*

tiquorum geſtis, & libris, collegimus, ſays the Letter: which being prior to *Fordon*, proves that all this was not *Fordon*'s Dream, and that our Hiſtory is well founded on old Records, prior to *Fordon*. And laſtly, it appears, that our Kings were not Vaſſals to *England* for their Crown, but only for theſe Provinces, as * my Lord St. *Aſaph* confeſſes, and as I have prov'd in my *Treatiſe of Precedency*; albeit our Independency was as much controverted of old, as our Antiquity is now: and I hope that the one will ſhortly appear as unjuſt a Pretence, as the other is already confeſt to be. From this it appears, that there is rather a Harmony than real Contradiction here, and that any ſeeming Contradiction is far leſs, than the real ones, betwixt *Beda*, and the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, and the following Contradictions, wherein he differs from himſelf. For clearing whereof, obſerve, That the Biſhop ſays * he queſtions not the truth of any thing that is ſaid to have been within 800, nay within 1400 Years; but ſo it is, that this would bring us to be ſetled

* Pag. 46.

* Pag. 8.

here, before the Year 300 after Chriſt: for ſubſtract 1400 out of 1684, (which is the Year in which the Biſhop prints his Book) his Lordſhip can controvert nothing except what was done within 284 Years after Chriſt: And yet he decryes our Hiſtorians, for ſaying, that we were ſettl'd here before the Year 503; and denies our being Chriſtians for many Years after the Year 300; and to improve this learn'd Biſhop's juſt Conceſſion, I muſt remark, that all our Hiſtorians agree, that *Gregory* the *great King* of *Scotland*, who died *Anno*, 892, added *Northumberland* to the *Merſe*; and having defeated the *Britons* at *Lochmaben*, he forc'd them to renew their ancient League, and to confirm to him the former Right, his Predeceſſors got from them to *Cumberland*, and *Weſtmorland*, for aſſiſting them againſt the Picts and Saxons; which ſhews alſo, what great things we could do, not only alone without, but even againſt the Picts. All which being ſaid by our Hiſtorians, not only within the 1400 Years,

Years, but the 800, are not controvertible by the Biſhop's conceſſion: and therefore I underſtand not why he aſſerts * that we had nothing but the Kingdom of *Argyle* before the beating and extirpating of the *Picts*, who gave us their poſſeſſion beyond *Drumalbain*. Nor can I reconcile, how the Biſhop aſſerts all alongſt, and particularly, * that the *Picts* had nothing beſouth *Grahams-dyke*, or the *Frith* of *Forth* and *Clyde*: and yet he confeſſes * that amongſt the *South-Picts*, there was a Monaſtery of St. *Martin* at *Whit-horn* founded by St. *Ninian*, in honour of that Saint; and *Whit-horn* is in *Galloway*, in the furtheſt ſouth point of our *Scotland*, near eighty miles beſouth *Forth*; and himſelf alſo confeſſes * * *Whit-horn* to be in *Galloway*.

* Pag. 42.

* Cap. 1. Paragraph 2, 3, and 12.

* Pag. 156.

* * Pag. 83.

The fourth Objection being, that our Hiſtorians have followed *Jeffrey* of *Monmoth*, in many rediculous inventions, which were purely his own; and particularly in the Hiſtory of *Baſſianus*, who being *Emperour*, is by him pretended to have been kill'd in *Britain*, by *Fulgenti-*

us ; which, tho *Buchannan* does not exactly follow, yet he ſtill makes *Baſſianus* to have been *a Roman Lieutenant*, and to have been kill'd in *Britain* ; whereas it appears not from any Roman Authors, that there was any Roman Lieutenant here. To this it is anſwered, That no Man comparing our Hiſtories with *Jeffrey* of *Monmouth*, can think ſo : for we bring not our Nation from *Brutus*, as he does againſt common ſenſe ; and tho *Jeffrey* tells a ſtory of *Baſſianus* the Emperour being kill'd in *Britain*, which contradicts the Roman Story ; yet *Fordon* does expreſly ſay * *it was not that* Baſſianus *who was Emperour*, but a Captain ſent here : and ſo does not follow, but contradict *Jeffrey*. And *Buchannan*, to ſhew that he does not follow him (and he underſtood too well the Roman Story to do ſo) only relates that there was a *Baſſianus* kill'd, which no Roman Hiſtory contradicts ; and which is not to be preſum'd *Buchannan* would have made, ſince there is nothing in it for the advantage of his Nation : and as

* *Non utiq; ille* Baſſianus, Caracalla, *qui tranſactis non paucis annis*, Severo *patri ſucceſſit, ſed alius jamtunc propter militiæ famam imperare electus. Scot. Chro. l. 2. c. 45.*

as it is probable, the *Emperour* would not have ſuffer'd *Carauſius* to make ſuch great preparations, without ſending a conſiderable *Captain*; eſpecially ſince *Eutropius* tells, that after many Wars attempted with *Carauſius*, he at laſt concluded to ſend a Captain againſt him, without naming who that Captain was. It were a hard thing therefore to conclude ſo great Authors were forgers, becauſe they condeſcend not upon an Author for every indifferent Circumſtance; and the * *Notitia Imperii* is ſo far from having taken notice of every Lieutenant in a Legion, that I can prove by many Texts of the Civil Law, that even Conſuls themſelves have been forgot, when they were only choſen to ſucceed to thoſe, who died during their Conſulſhip.

* *Vid.* Inſtit. *ad* Senatuſ. *Con.* Trebell.

But the great Objection uſed by the Biſhop, againſt our Antiquity, lyes in the 4th § of the Biſhop's firſt Chapter, wherein he aſſerts, *That* Ireland *was peopled by the Scots, and was the only* Scotland *before theſe times, viz.* before the Year 503: And in the 5th §, *That there were no*

Scots *in* Britain *before the ſaid Year* 300. And in the *6th* and *8th* §; *That the* Scots, *betwixt the* 300 *and* 500 *Years, were indeed here, but not ſetled, and only by way of Incurſion.* And in the *9th* §, he aſſerts, *That about the Year* 500 *they firſt ſetled here, and erected the Kingdom of* Argile. And in the *12th* and *13th* §, he aſſerts, *That after the Year* 900, *we got the reſt of the Country, and then only it came to be called* Scotland.

For clearing all theſe Miſtakes, without partiality or humour, I ſhall ſum up my Anſwers in theſe diſtinct Propoſitions.

First, It is undeniable in it ſelf, and acknowledged by our Adverſaries, that the firſt ſpecial Names, under which *Ireland* was known, were *Jerna* among the * Greeks, and *Hibernia* among the Latins: both of which are, as I ſaid, acknowledg'd by † Biſhop *Uſher* himſelf.

* *Ptolom. Geog.* lib. 2. cap. 2.

† P. 722, 723, and particularly 724. *Hanc inſulam* Britannidem *olim à* Julio Cæſare *vocatam* Fabius Ethelwardus *haud recte retulit: non alio enim quam* Hiberniæ *nomine, à* Cæſare, *uti poſt eum à* Plinio, Solino, & Tacito *illam invenimus.*

My

My ſecond Poſition is, That before the Year 300, there is no Foreign Author produced by either Nation, that mentions *Scotia*, *Scoti*, or *Scoticæ gentes*, except *Seneca*, who mentions the *Scoto-brigantes*: and *Florus* the *Scoticæ pruinæ*: and *Hegiſippus*, who mentions *Scotia*: and *Porphyrie*, who mentions *Scoticæ gentes*. And tho I have prov'd formerly all theſe Authors and Paſſages to be genuine, and applicable to us alone: yet, *tho they were only ſpurious Authors, or the conjectural Readings of new Criticks*, as Biſhop * *Uſher* (whom my Lord St. *Aſaph* follows) alledges, *Porphyrie* only excepted, whoſe Teſtimony is admitted by him to be in the third Century. It clearly follows, that my Lord St. *Aſaph* has, without ſufficient Warrant, aſſerted in the forementioned place, that *Ireland* was called *Scotland* before the Year 300: he admitting no Author for this, ſave *Porphyrie*, whoſe Book he acknowledges not to be extant, but to be only cited by *Jerom*, who liv'd long after the Year 300.

* P. 725, 726, 727, 728.

† Cap. 1. §. 4.

3. My

3. My chief Deſign in this Book, is not to debate the Antiquity of the Names of *Scotia*, or *Scoti*, but only when we firſt ſetled under Kings in this Iſle. And conſequently though Arch-biſhop *Uſher*, and the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* could prove, that the words *Scotia*, and *Scoti*, were not known the firſt 300 Years, except in *Porphyrie*; yet that cannot prove that we were not ſetled here before that Time. For it is undeniable, that many Nations have had peculiar Names, before thoſe Names can be found in Hiſtory, as *Scaliger* very well proves: and they could not be known in Hiſtories, till other Nations had commerce with them, and wrote of them, which was a thing very accidental. And Foreigners do oft-times deſign Nations by Appellatives, which they themſelves invent. And it is aſſerted by Bp *Uſher*, that the Scots inhabited *Ireland* long before the Year 300, tho till then he cannot give an Author for that word. And who can deny that the Picts liv'd long here before *Eumenius*,

nius, who firſt mention'd them, and liv'd long after *Porphyrie* who mentions the Scots? And it is very obſervable that to this day, neither the Iriſh nor we are call'd Scots in the true Iriſh Language; for they call their own Country-men *Erenach*, from the word *Jerna*, or *Ibernia*, and us *Albanach*, from *Albion*, and *Albania*: Which alſo clears, that we got that name long before *Julius Cæſar*'s Time; ſince before that time, the word *Albian* was run into deſuetude, and was ſucceeded to by the more known name of *Britannia*: And theſe Originations are the more confirm'd, that to this day the ſame Iriſh, and our Highlanders, know no other names to the Engliſh, ſave *Saſſanach*, becauſe of *Saxony* from which they came; as they call'd us *Albanach* (to diſtinguiſh us from themſelves) from the Country to which we came. Which may give us likewiſe a hint, how by Names, without Hiſtories, moſt ancient Monuments of Antiquity may be preſerv'd: And it is fully prov'd before that time, we were known in this Coun-

* *Beda* l. 1. c. 1. † *Tacit.* in vita *Agricol.*

Country, under the name of * *Dalreudini*, and † *Caledonii*.

4. All thoſe uncontroverted Teſtimonies, that make firſt mention of the Scots, and of *Scotland*, are only applicable to us: ſuch as *Claudian*, *Pacatius*, *Ammianus*, &c. as has formerly been fully prov'd. And ſince *Hegeſippus* is the firſt Author produc'd by the Bp of St. *Aſaph*, who mentions *Scotia*; and that it has been formerly prov'd, that theſe Paſſages relate to Us, and not to *Ireland*; it follows clearly, that the name *Scotia* was given to Us, before it was given to *Ireland*, or that the Iriſh were call'd *Scoti*: Albeit it were admitted that the Works aſcribed to *Hegeſippus*, were really St. *Ambroſes*, who flouriſhed before the Year 400. And *Cambden* acknowledges that the Name of *Scotland* came over with the Scots to *Britain*, cap. 1. *Hibernia*. And therefore ſince I have prov'd, that the Scots came over before *Julius Cæſar*'s Time; it follows from *Cambden*, that the name of *Scotland* was aſcribed to us before them.

5. Tho

5. Tho it be true, and acknowledg'd on all hands, that *Ireland* was inhabited by the Nation of the Scots, as is written by *Oroſius* in the Year 417; and that it be true that our Colony came from *Ireland*, as *Beda* and our Hiſtorians commonly aſſert, and that thence it may be ſaid, that *Hibernia eſt proprie Scotorum Patria.* It will not follow that either We, or the Iriſh were called Scots before that Time; or that becauſe We have deriv'd our Colony from the *Iriſh*, that therefore We have deriv'd the Name of *Scoti* from them. But on the contrary, ſuppoſing with *Uſher*, that the *Nomen Scoticum* had been firſt given in the third Century, then the Name behov'd to have been ours originally, who were more known and conſider'd in the World than they, becauſe of the honour we had in the Roman Wars (whoſe Authors do firſt mention *Scoti*, and *Scotia*) and our early converſion to the Chriſtian Faith: And by our frequent intercourſe of Colonies with the Iriſh (as about the time of *Fergus* the ſecond).

It

It is probable we did communicate the Name of *Scoti* to theſe Inhabitants in *Ireland*, from whoſe Anceſtors we were deſcended, and among whom our Colonies, that were returned, ſetled; as at this day, the Scots in the North of *Ireland* do retain the Name, and as we had the name of *Hibernia* communicated to us from them; which is abundantly clear'd from what is ſaid out of *Eumenius* and *Gildas*. So that theſe names of *Hiberni* and *Scoti* have become common to both People; but with this difference, that as the Iriſh were originally called *Hiberni*; ſo our Scots were originally *Scoti*. For of all the Paſſages produced by Archbiſhop *Uſher*, or Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, to prove the Iriſh to be called *Scoti*, that of *Oroſius* is the firſt that is applicable to them: for thoſe from *Claudian*, *Ammianus*, *Pacatius*, and *Hegiſippus* do not at all agree with them; nor yet that Paſſage from *Proſper*, as has been proved; nor theſe from *Gildas*: for tho he calls thoſe People, who are ſaid to return home, *Hiberni*, or *Iriſh*; yet he

* he calls the ſame People who return'd home, *Scots*, and not *Iriſh*. And the Actions to which theſe Paſſages cited againſt us relate, are uncontrovertedly by *Beda*, *Gildas*, and all the Roman Authors, applicable to Us, and not to the Iriſh: being the three Vaſtations made by the *Picts*, and *Us* in the Britiſh Territories. And *Marianus* (whom the Biſhop likewiſe cites againſt us) * does expreſsly apply this to the Scots; for he uſes the word *Scoti*, in ſpeaking of all the three Vaſtations. And whereas *Gildas* uſeth the word *Scoti*, ſpeaking of the firſt two Vaſtations, and ſays, *Hiberni revertuntur domum*, ſpeaking of the laſt: *Marianus*, repeating the ſame paſſage, ſays, *Scoti revertuntur domum*. By which alſo I infer by a far better Conſequence, that the Scots muſt be ſaid to return to the place where they were formerly ſettled; but ſo it is, that the place where the Scots were formerly ſetled was the Weſt of *Scotland*, and therefore when they return'd home, they return'd not to *Ireland*, as the Bp of St. *Aſaph* alledges, but

*Pag. 117, 118. *inter Orthodoxogr.*

* Pag. 347. *Edit. Baſn.*

but to our North-weſt Country, as we contend: for the word in *Gildas*, is *à Circio*, which ſignifies North-Weſt; and *Ireland* lies South-Weſt from *Grahams-Dyke*, near which theſe Actions were done: But *Argile*, and thoſe Iſles which We poſſeſſed, lies indeed North-Weſt from it. And if they had return'd to *Ireland*, they had been *Tranſ-marine*, as living in another Iſle, contrary to *Gildas*'s own expreſs aſſertion, as it is interpreted by *Beda*, cap. 12. lib. 2.

2. Why ſhould the *Picts* and *Scots* (being ſpoke of as to their going home together, the one to the North, and the other to the Weſt) not be thought to have gone home to the ſame Iſle, ſince different Iſles are not mentioned? and if I ſaid, I were going to the Weſt, that in common ſenſe could only be underſtood, of the Weſt of that *Kingdom* or Iſland where I then were; and not of any other Kingdom lying to the Weſt thereof. And both the Picts and Scots being equally called *Tranſ-marine* Nations, if the Scots went

went out of the Isle, it must follow that the *Picts* left it also, which never any was so ridiculous as to alledge. By all which it clearly follows, that the words *Scoti & Hiberni* were, before these Times, promiscuously ascribed to us. And tho *Beda* may speak of the *Scots* coming from *Ireland*, and setling a third Colony in *Britain* long before *Julius Cæsar*'s time, yet that doth only prove the Antiquity of the Settlement of the People that are call'd *Scoti*, but not the Antiquity of their Name, concerning which *Beda* was not treating: for he rather seems to insinuate the contrary, when * he says, *Aquo* (viz. *duce* Reuda) *usque hodie Dalreudini vocantur.*

* Lib. 1. cap. 1.

6. The Passages produced by the Bp of St. *Asaph* & *Usher*, for proving that *Ireland* was called *Scotia*, after the Age that *Hegisippus* or *Ambrose* liv'd in, and within the 1000 Years, are very few: and many of them from Legendary Writers. But I shall glance at the most material. The first is *Isidor Hispalensis*, who

liv'd in the 7th Century, and who says * Scotia *eadem &* Hibernia, *proxima* Britanniæ *Insula, spatio terrarum angustior, sed situ fœcundior.* The same words are used by *Orosius*, whom he follows, except that *Orosius* calls the Inhabitans *Scoti*, but does not call the Country *Scotia*, but *Hibernia:* so that *Orosius* having first call'd the Inhabitants of *Ireland*, *Scoti*, in the Year 417; *Isidor* by an ordinary derivation calls their Country *Scotia*, and is the first that Arch-bishop *Usher*, or the Bishop of Saint *Asaph*, does produce to prove *Hibernia* to be call'd *Scotia?* and is in the Year 620, and so is too late to prove their Design, since it is clearly prov'd that our Country was called *Scotia* in St. *Ambrose*'s Time, even by their own concession. And whereas the same *Isidor*, speaking of *Ireland* says, *hæc est proprie* Scotorum *patria*; beside what has been formerly urged, it is observable that the word *proprie* does imply as if it might have been justly doubted, and that it was not true in all senses: especially since * *Beda* uses the

* Lib. 14. cap. de insulis.

* Cap. 1. lib. 1.

the very ſame expreſſion, after that he has fully cleared that we were ſettled here long before that time: and therefore it doth neceſſarly follow that theſe words are conſiſtent with our being ſettled here; and conſequently that they muſt not be ſo interpreted, as to infer that *Ireland* was the place where We then liv'd but only the place from which We came: And ſuch as underſtand the Civil Law, (the beſt Standard of the Latine Language) muſt acknowled, that there is, * *Patria Originis*, as well as *Incolatûs & domicilii*: And it may be juſtly ſaid of thoſe of *Virgina* and other Engliſh Plantations, that, Anglia *eſt proprie illorum patria*: And generally it is obſervable, that the Authors relating both to us and them, do firſt call the People *Scoti*, and then the Country *Scotia*: but ſtill the more ancient Authors call us *Scoti* before them, and our Country *Scotia* before theirs.

* Cujac.lib.14. Obſ. 12. *& ad legem 6. parag. gramatici ff. de excuſ. mun.*

As to the Citations out of *Adamnanus in vita Columbæ*, and *Beda*:

It is certain that *Adamnanus* is lately publiſh'd by an Iriſh Hand, as appears by the Marginal Notes, the Publiſher ſtill adding *Hibernia* in the Magin, where *Scotia* is in the Text. But however it is certain that *Adamnanus* was Abbot of *Hy*, which is *Ikolmkil* among the Scotiſh Weſt Iſlands: ſo that in *dubio* he is preſum'd to be a Scots-man, and not an Iriſh; and *Balæus* and others poſitively aſſert him to be a Scots-man. Nor is there any reaſon for their calling him an Iriſh-man; but becauſe all Authors who ſpeak of him, call him *Scotus*; and to aſſert a Man to be an Iriſh-man, becauſe he is called Scots-man, is rather a Bull than a Reaſon. But becauſe he is mention'd by *Beda*, who liv'd ſhortly after him, and is an Author of far greater Authority. What I ſhall obſerve from *Beda*, will ſerve to clear the Citations out of both.

And firſt, *Beda* * relates, *That* Ecgfrid *King of* Northumberland, *having ſent an Army into* Ireland *under* Bertus, *he waſted*

* Ecgfridus *Rex* Nordanhumbrorum *miſſo in* Hiberniam *cum exercitu duce* Berto, *vaſtavit miſere gentem innoxiam &* Anglorum *genti ſemper amiciſſimam.* Bed. *Hiſt. Eccl. lib.* 4. *cap.* 26.

waſted the Country, and the innocent People. And the next Year, having ſent an Army to waſte the Province of the Picts, contrary to the advice of his Friends, and of St. *Cuthbert*, God ſuffered that Army to be deſtroy'd, becauſe the former Year he had rejected their Advice; * *That he ſhould not invade* Scotland, *which did not wrong him.* And to clear that the *Scotia* here expreſs'd was not *Ireland*, he adds, † *The Engliſh and Scots who abide in* Britain. This Paſſage (as well as the others which I have cited, and ſhall cite) proves, 1. That *Scotland* then was promiſcuouſly expreſs'd by the names of *Hibernia* and *Scotia:* For the ſame thing is ſaid firſt to have been done in *Hibernia*, and thereafter it is ſaid to have been done in *Scotia:* And this anſwers the Objection, *Hiberni revertuntur domum*; and where could their Home be but in *Ireland?* 2. It proves that this our Country was call'd *Scotia* in *Beda*'s Time; and ſo long before the Year 1000, which the Biſhop denies. Nor can it be prov'd that the King of *Northumberland* went to make

* *Ne* Scotiam *nihil ſe Lædentem impugnaret.* Id.

† Angli & Scoti *qui extant in* Britannia. *Ibid.*

War in *Ireland*; nor ſpeaks *Beda* of any War with *Ireland*.

The next Paſſage from *Beda* is, where he ſays, * *That* Columbanus *an* Abbot *and* Preſbyter, *came in the year* 565, *from* Ireland *to* Britain, *to preach the Word of God to the Provinces of the* North-picts: *and converted them; and got from them poſſeſſion of the former Island for founding a Monaſtery, where he was buried. Out of which Monaſtery* (meaning *Hy*) *many other Monaſteries were propagated in* Ireland *and* Britain; *in all which the ſame* Iſland-Monaſtery *was the chief.* And he takes notice, that the Succeſſors of this Abbot differed in the Obſervation of *Eaſter* from the Church of *Rome*, till the Year 716. And thereafter he ſays, That * Aidan *was ſent from this* Iſland *for inſtructing the Province of the* Engliſh. Now he had ſaid before, Aidan

* Columbanus *qui anno incarnationis* 565. Abbas & Presbyter *venit de* Hibernia *in* Britanniam *prædicaturus Verbum* Dei *provinciis ſeptentrionalium* Pictorum. *Et gentem illam convertit, Unde & præfatam inſulam ab eis in poſſeſſionem monaſterii faciendi accepit; ubi ſepultus eſt. Ex quo Monaſterio, & Monaſterio de* Daermach *perplurima Monaſteria propagata ſunt in* Hibernia & Britannia, *in quibus omnibus* idem Monaſterium inſulanum, *principatum tenet.* Bed. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 4.

* *Ab hac ergo inſula, ad Provinciam* Anglorum *inſtituendam in* Chriſto, *miſſus eſt* Aidanus. *Lib.* 3. *c.* 5.

† Aidan *who was ſent from the* Iſle *which is called* Hy, *which is the chief of the* Scotiſh *and* Pictiſh *Monaſteries, and belongs to* Britain. And thereafter he * ſays, *That* Colman *ſeeing his Doctrine ſlighted, and his Adherents deſpiſed, returned to* Scotland. So that we ſee, that that which at the firſt is called * *Ireland*; afterward is called † the *ſaid Iſland*, and the Monaſtery in it, the * *Iſland-Monaſtery*; and thereafter it is † called the Iſle of *Hy*; and thereafter it is * called *Scotland*.

† Aidanus *de inſula quæ vocatur* Hy *deſtinatus, quæ arcem tenet monaſteriorum* Scotorum *&* Pictorum, *& ad jus* Britanniæ *pertinet.* l. 3. c. 3.

* Colman *videns ſpretam ſuam doctrinam, ſectamq; eſſe deſpectam; Scotiam regreſſus eſt.* l. 3. c. 26.

*Cap. 4. † *Ibid.*

**Ibid.* † Cap. 3.

* Cap. 26.

I ſhall cite a third Paſſage from *Beda*, where ſpeaking of a great Plague in *Britain*, he adds, * *This Plague alſo waſted* Ireland *with the ſame deſtruction; at which time there were there many of the Nobility and Commons of* England, *who in the time of the Biſhops,* Finan *and* Colman *having left their own Native Iſland for the greater convenience, either of Divine Studies, or*

* *Hæc autem plaga* Hiberniam *inſulam, pariclade premebat: Erant ibidem eodem tempore multi Nobilium ſimul & mediocrium de gente* Anglorum, *qui tempore* Finani *&* Colmanni Epiſcoporum, *relictâ inſulâ patriâ, vel divinæ lectionis, vel continentioris vitæ gratiâ, illo ſeceſſerunt.---Quos omnes* Scori *libentiſſime ſuſpicientes victum eis quotidianum ſine prætio, libros quoq; ad legendum, & magiſterium gratuitum præbere curabant.* l. 3. c. 27.

a more ſtrict Life, had retired thither. —*All whom the Scots kindly entertain'd, and furniſhed with all things neceſſary, and gave them freely Meat, and Books to read, and Learning,* And thereafter ſpeaking of *Egbert*, who was among them, he adds, † That *he was a good Example to his own Nation, and to the Nations of the* Picts *and* Scots *among whom he liv'd retiredly*; by which paſſages it is evident, that that which is here called *Ireland*, is really our *Scotland*; firſt, becauſe it is ſaid, *they came from* England *upon the occaſion of* Finan *and* Colman, who were our Countrymen, and whoſe chief reſidence was the Iſle of *Hy*, or *Icolm-kill*, (from which they came) which did then, and does ſtill belong to us only, and which the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* alſo * confeſſes: and then *becauſe in their Monaſtick Life*, it is ſaid, they reſided among the *Scots* and *Picts*, and † it is ſaid before that the Iſland where the Monaſtery was, belonged to *Britain*.

† *Unde & genti ſuæ, & illis in quibus exulabat nationibus* Scotorum *ſive* Pictorum *exemplo fuit.* Ibid.

* *Cap.* 5. generally, and ſpecially, *p.*109.

† Lib. 3. cap. 3. *& ad jus* Britanniæ *pertinet.*

But

But for further clearing the former Citations, from *Beda* I ſhall offer theſe following Conſiderations. 1. That *Beda* treats only the Actions of theſe five Nations that did inhabite *Britain*: and if he do ſpeak of *France* or *Ireland*, it is but upon occaſion of them; as of the ſituation of *Ireland* from whence the Scots came, or of ſome Monaſteries depending upon *Icolm-kill*, which perhaps were ſituated near us, in the North of *Ireland*: and therefore unleſs all theſe paſſages were clearly applicable to *Ireland*, they muſt be underſtood of *Scotland*. 2. It being certain, that *Beda*, in the beginning of his Book, treats concerning the *Scots* in *Britain*, the *Roman* Wars with them, and *Palladius*'s being ſent to them, it neceſſarily follows, that the reſt of the Book mentioning the Scots, or that part of the Iſle poſſeſs'd by them, is to be underſtood of us, whether the Country be called *Hibernia* or *Scotia*, or We *Hiberni* or *Scoti*: eſpecially ſince *Beda* mentions a King call'd *Aidan*

* *Buch.* p. 152. *Aidan*; and * we had a King of that Name in that time, which the *Iriſh* cannot pretend. *Beda* treats alſo concerning the Abbots of *Hy*, which is *Icolm-kill*, as is clear by that paſſage, * where he ſays, Columba, *Founder of the Monaſtery in the Iſle of* Hy, *venerable to the* Scots *and* Picts, *which by a compounded name from* Columba *and* Cell *is called* Icolm-kill. And that the Monks ſent from this Monaſtery, or Iſland, were the Converters of the *North-Saxons*, and the firſt Biſhops of *Lindisfern* or *Holy-Island?* Predeceſſors of the Biſhop of *Durham*. 3. He makes frequent mention of little Iſlands, which never did belong to *Ireland*, but to *Sotland*, and are ſtill called *Hebrides*; And ſo as the chief of theſe Iſles where the Abbot reſided the Records were kept, and the Kings were buried, might probably be called *Inſula Hiberniæ*, or *Hibernia*, and that *Scotia* might be the Ordinary name to all that part of the Iſle of *Britain* benorth the River of *Clyde*: ſo that the going from *Hibernia*, or *Scotia*, *in Britanniam*,

* Columba *fundator monaſterii quod in* Hy *inſula, venerabile* Scotis *&* Pictis, *& compoſito nomine à Cellâ & Columbâ Collum-celli vocatur.* lib. 5. c. 10.

niam, is nothing but the going to the other ſide of *Clyde*, * by which, and *Graham's-Dyke*, that part of the Iſle was diſtinguiſhed from the reſt, as if it had been a diſtinct Iſland. 4. The great Controverſy at that Time being about the keeping of *Eaſter*, *Laurentius Mellitus*, and *Juſtus*, Biſhops, did write a Letter to us of the following Tenor. * Laurentius Mellitus, *and* Juſtus, *Biſhops, Servants of all the Servants of God, To our deareſt Brethren, the Biſhops and Abbots through all* Scotland. *Whileas the Apoſtolick Sea, according to the cuſtom it hath obſerv'd in the reſt of the World, did ſend us to preach the Goſpel unto the Heathens in theſe Weſtern Parts; and that it happened to us to come into this Iſle which is called* Britain; *we held in religious reverence both the* Scots

* Bed. l. 1. c. 12.

* *Dominis Chariſſimis fratribus* Epiſcopis *vel* Abbatibus *per univerſam* Scotiam Laurentius Mellitus, *&* Juſtus, *Epiſcopi ſervi ſervorum Dei. Dum nos Sedes Apoſtolica more ſuo, ſicut in univerſo orbe terrarum, in his occiduis partibus ad predicandum gentibus Paganis dirigeret, atq; in hanc inſulã, qua* Britannia *nuncupatur, contigit introiſſe, antequam cognoſceremus credentes, quod juxta morem univerſalis Eccleſiæ ingrederentur, in magna reverentia ſanctitatis tam* Britones *quam* Scotos *venerati ſumus. Sed cognoſcentes* Britones, Scotos *meliores putavimus.* Scotos *vero per* Dagamum Epiſcopum *in hanc quam ſuperius memoravimus inſulam, &* Columbanum Abbatum *in* Galliis *venientem, nihil diſcrepare à* Britonibus *in eorum converſatione didicimus. Nam* Dagamus Epiſcopus *ad nos veniens, non ſolum cibum nobiſcum, ſed nec in eodem hoſpitio quo veſcebamur ſumere voluit.* Bed. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 14.

and

and Britons, *believing that they did walk after the Custom of the* Universal Church. *But after we had known the* Britons, *we judg'd the* Scots *to be the better minded: Yet now we perceive by* Dagamus, *the Bishop who is come hither, and by* Columbanus *the Abbot in* France, *that the Scots differ nothing in their Observations from the Britons; for* Dagamus *being here, refused not only to eat with us, but even to stay in the same Inn or Lodging.* Now that this is only applicable to us, and not to the Scots in *Ireland*, the Subject doth prove, being Exhortatory Letters, to conform in the Observation of *Easter*, wherein the British Scots, who follow'd *Columba*, differ'd from the Roman Church. 2. The Letter is written to the Scots, and relates to other Letters written to the Britons in the same Isle; and who needed the same Exhortation. And it is to be remembred, That *Usher* generally concludes, that where the Scots and Britons are mention'd in Conjunction, by Scots there, are to be understood the British Scots.

3. *Came-*

3. * *Camerarius* cites *Georgius Newton*, who about the Year 1500, being then Arch-deacon of *Dumblain*, did write the Acts of that Church; and relates that he had ſeen the *Antographum* of that Letter among the Records of that Church; and ſo it muſt neceſſarily have been written to the Scots in *Britain*, elſe it had not been in the cuſtody of our Churchmen, and at *Dumblain*.

* In Append. *ad l.* 3. *p.* 231. And it is obſervable that *Marianus*, *p.* 175 makes mention of other two Letters, in the Year 632. The one from *Honorius*, and the other from Pope *John*, upon the ſame head: both which *Marianus* ſays, were ſent to us, and not to the Iriſh.

I could produce many other Citations to prove *Scotland* to have been call'd *Hibernia* in thoſe Ages: but it is ſufficient to add to theſe unanſwerable Proofs already produced, the authority of the Roman Martyrology; wherein *Sanctus Beanus* is deſign'd *Epiſcopus Aberdoniæ in Hibernia*, at the 16 of *December*. To which *Vardæus* an Iriſh-man *in vita Rumoldi* anſwers, That there might have been a place in *Ireland* call'd *Aberdeen*, becauſe *Aber* is an Iriſh word, ſignifying a *Mariſh*, and there is a Town call'd *Doun* in *Ireland*, ſituated near a *Mariſh*. A pretty Witticiſm indeed! eſpecially as he pro-

proposes the Objection, and answers the same, as you may see upon the Margin. * But to take off all Debate, *Beanus* is nam'd in our *Chartularies*, as well as *Histories*, as the first Bishop of *Aberdeen*: and the Mortifications granted to him by our King *Malcom* 2d, in the Year 1010, of the Lands of *Murthlack*, *Cloveth*, and *Dounmeth*, are yet extant: and his Tomb is yet to be seen in the Cathedral of *Aberdeen*, at the Postern Door of the Church.

To the former Passages I must also add, That albeit our Country was promiscuously call'd *Scotia*, and *Hibernia*, as has been prov'd, yet *Scotia*, even in that Time, was the more frequent Name of our Country: and which, to keep close to *Beda*, appears; for when he speaks of the Isle *Hy*, (to which the former Citations chiefly relate, and which was the place of our Country,

* *Dices in* Martyrologio Romano vulgari *legi ad diem* 16. Decembris, Aberdone *in* Hibernia S. Beani Episcopi: Abredonensis *autem* sedes Episcopalis *est in* Scotia Britannica: *Ergo vel in hac est, vel hac aliquando fuit* Hibernia. *pag.* 379.

Ad nugatorium ergo Sophisma *distinguo* Minorem: Abredonensis, *locus de quo* Martyrologium *agit, est in* Britannia, *Nego* Minorem: *alius ejusdem nominis, transeat. Vel absolute, Nego Consequentiam, ob fallaciam figuræ dictionis; ut hanc,* Omnis Canis est latrabilis; sed sidus est canis; Ergo sidus est latrabile, *&c.* pag. 380.

try, in which his Hiſtory being Eccleſiaſtick, is chiefly concern'd, as being then one of (if not) the moſt famous Monaſtery in the Weſtern World) he expreſſes it to be in *Scotia*: as where he tells, That * Ceollach, *of the Nation of the* Scots, *leaving his Biſhoprick in* England, *returned to* Hy, *where the* Scots *had their chief Monaſtery*: And thereafter he tells, That † *the ſame* Ceollach *having left his Biſhoprick*, *return'd to* Scotland. And the ſame * *Beda*, writing of *Adamnanus*, calls him *Abbot and Presbyter of the Monks that are in the Monaſtery of* Hy. And mentioning the ſame *Adamnanus*, † he tells, that *he returned to* Scotland, *after his Embaſſy in* England. And how can it be denied that *Hy* is in *Scotland*? ſince *Beda* calls it *Scotland*, and ſays, That *it belong'd to* Britain: and is by all Geographers nam'd one of our *Hebrides*, and lies locally within our Coun-

* Ceollach *de Natione* Scotorum, *qui non multo poſt Epiſcopatu relicto reverſus eſt ad inſulam* Hy, *ubi plurimorum caput & arcem* Scoti *habuere cœnobiorum.* Bed. *l.*3. *c.*21.

† Ceollach *qui relicto Epiſcopatus officio vivens ad* Scotiam *rediit.* Bed. *l.*3. *c.*24.

* Adamnanus *Presbyter & Abbas Monachiorum qui erant in inſula* Hy. Bed. *l.*5. *c.*16.

† Adamnanus *reverſus ad* Scotiam. Bed. *l.*5. *c.*22.

Country; and was one of the first places which we planted, and far remoter from *Ireland*, than *Kintire* and others of our Islands; and in which our Kings were buried, and our Records kept.

To conclude this Proposition, I shall add these Reflections.

1. That it is not so easy for the Bishop of St. *Asaph* to explicate himself as to these Passages concerning *Scotia* and *Scoti*, and to make them signifie *Ireland* and *Irish*, since the 500 Year, as before: for admitting that the Terms were anciently applicable to *Ireland*, and that the *Scots* when mention'd here, were but by Invasion from *Ireland*; Yet it being acknowledg'd, that after the Year 500 we were settled here; It follows, that when *Scotia* and *Scoti* are mention'd in relation to British affairs, and in conjuction with the Inhabitans of *Britain*, they must be understood of us, and our Country. 2. *Beda* mentioning our Country to be call'd *Scotia*, as well as *Hibernia*, from *Columba*'s Time to his

his own, it is not only an evidence, that it was ſo call'd in that Time, but that the Name had not been then firſt given, otherwiſe he could not have been ignorant of the Change, nor would he have failed to remark it: ſo that we may reaſonably conclude in his ſenſe, the Name of *Scotia* is as ancient in *Britain*, as the Time he mentions the Settlement, Wars, and Religion of the Scots there. 3. It is evident, That the Bp of St. *Aſaph*'s * Propoſition is faulty, *viz.* That, *when we ſettled here after the Year* 500, *our Kingdom was call'd* Argyle, *or* Dalrieda: for if this had been true, this name being ſo recent, could not but have been noticed and uſed by *Gildas* and *Beda*, and yet it is never ſo much as once mention'd by either of them; tho *Beda*, upon the occaſion of the Monaſtery of *Hy*, or *Icolm-kill*, and of the Biſhops ſent thence to *England*, doth frequently mention the Names *Hibernia* and *Scotia*, and that St. *Aſaph* * doth not controvert, but that theſe Biſhops were ſent from our Iſle of *Icolm-kill* to *England*. 4. We may obſerve how

* Cap. 1. §. 9.

* Cap. 5. §. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

warrantable * Arch-biſhop *Uſher's* Poſition (repeated by the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*) is, That no Author mentions our Country by the name of *Scotia* for the firſt 1000 years; whereas moſt of all the former Authors, both within and without the Iſle, prove *Scotia* to have been the name of our Country: and the whole Tract of *Beda's* Hiſtory proves, that ſince the year 560, this Country was generally ſo called: Whereas neither *Gildas*, nor *Beda*, who lived near that Time, and wrote whole Books of us, do once call it *Dalrieda*, or *Argyle*: and conſequently (as I obſerv'd before) the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph's* whole Sect. 9. of the firſt Chapter, wherein he aſſerts, that about the Year 500, the Scots erected the Kingdom of *Argile*, or *Dalrieda*, is moſt unwarrantable; for though *Beda* calls us once *Dalreudini*, yet this is ſpoken of us by him, in the Time of our King *Reuda*, and ſo near 70 Years before the 503 after Chriſt. And from this alſo ariſes a clear confutation of what the Biſhop of St. *Aſaph* aſſerts, that

* Pag. 734.

that no Author writing within the 1000 Years, and naming *Scotia*, means Us; which is ſo far from being ſo, that no Author of Credit (*Iſidore* only excepted) did then by *Scotia* mean *Ireland*. And the beſt Authority that Arch-biſhop *Uſher* gives us for *Dalrieda*, is *Jocelin*; which my Lord St. *Aſaph* hath improved by a new authority out of a Manuſcript of the Lord *Burghlie*'s, where the Author thinks that *Dalrieda*, and the Kingdom of *Argile*, are the ſame. Authors not to be once mentioned with thoſe whom we cite.

7. The diſtinction of *Scotia Major*, and *Minor*, is lately invented; for either *Ireland* was called *Scotia Major* before the Year 1000, or only ſince: if the firſt, then it neceſſarily implyeth, that at that Time our Country was alſo call'd *Scotia Minor*, there being no other place aſſignable. But this is contrary to Arch-biſhop *Uſher*, and my Lord St. *Aſaph*'s Poſition, who deny our Country was called *Sco-*

tia at all for the firſt 1000 Years. If it be aſſerted that this diſtinction was after the 1000 Years, then there was little or no uſe for it: For * *Uſher* tells us, that *Nubienſis Geographus*, about the Year 1150, deſcribes *Ireland* by the name of *Hibernia*, and deſcribes our Country by the name of *Scotia*: and ſo it ſeems at that time *Ireland* had loſt the name in our favour; and it is not to be imagin'd that *Nubienſis* remarked the firſt Periods of the change of the Name; and Geographers do deſcribe Countries by their ordinary Names. Nor does *Uſher* * produce any other Teſtimony, ſave a Letter of *Dovenaldus Oneil* Prince of *Ulſter* to Pope *John* 22*d*, wherein there is this paſſage, * *Beſide the Kings of leſſer* Scotland, *who all came originally from our* greater Scotland. And a Patent of *Sigiſmund* the Emperor, † *To the Convent of the* Scots *and* Iriſh *of* Greater Scotland *of a Monaſtery in* Ratiſbone. Now *Uſher* acknowledgeth the eldeſt of theſe two Citations, were in the 14*th* or 15*th* Century; when I hope no body

* Pag. 734.

* Pag. 724, & 737.

* *Quod præter Reges minoris* Scotiæ, *qui omnes de noſtra* majore Scotia *originem ſumpſere.*

† *Conventus* Scotorum & Hibernorum *de* majore Scotia *Monaſterii in* Ratisbona.

body will assert, that *Ireland* was called *Scotia Major*, or that ever the Kings of *England*, who were Lords of *Ireland*, were ever called Lords *Majoris Scotiæ*; and it is probable they would have very much affected that Title (if the Country had had that name) altho they could never make themselves Masters *Scotiæ Minoris*. But it is no wonder, that the Irish should be glad to tell Foreigners, that they were our Chief, and so their Country ought to be called *Scotia Major*; notwithstanding that our Nation was then become great and glorious: and that *Usher* can find no better authority for his distinction of *Scotia Major* and *Minor*, than these borrowed and magnifying Names, used long after he himself acknowledgeth that *Ireland* had lost the name of *Scotia*, and that We were only in possession of it.

8. The mistaking of the Names of *Scotia* and *Hibernia*, and of that assertion, Scotia *eadem* & Hibernia, and applying these Names still to

Ireland, and not to our Country, hath been the Ground whereupon we have been injured, as to the antiquity of our *Kings* and *Country*, *Saints* and *learned Men*, *Monaſteries*, and *greatneſs Abroad*. For admitting it to be true, that we were not ſetled here till the Year 500, yet we have been ſo happy, as to have ſuch excellent Men, and to have done ſo conſiderable Actions, as have been ſufficient to tempt our Neighbours, and particularly the Iriſh, to take great pains to have both paſs for their own. In order to which the Iriſh have lately invented the diſtinction of *Scotia Major* and *Minor*, to the end, that when any conſiderable Perſon is called a Scots-man in Hiſtory, they might claim him as deſcended from the *Greater Scotland*. But beſides, that this diſtinction is too new to be extended to ancient Writers, How can it be imagined that our Country, only having paſſed under the Name of *Scotland* before the 300, and after the 1100, as has been proved, *Ireland* ſhould have aſſumed the Name of *Scotland* in

in that Interval? Is it not more reaſonable to think that our Country, which alone was deſign'd by that Name, before the 300, and after 1100, bore it likewiſe only, or at leaſt chiefly, during that interval. But to aſſert that, during that ſpace, another Country had our old and preſent deſignation in a more peculiar manner than we; and that in dubious Caſes it muſt be appropriated to them, is a piece of confidence which even eminent Wit and Learning cannot ſupport. And yet we find, in *Malcom* the Second's Time, (as was formerly obſerv'd) who began to Reign in the Year 1004, That the Frith of *Forth* (in his Laws, in the Book of *Regiam Majeſtatem*) is call'd *Mare Scotiæ*: And it is ſaid there, that the ſame King did diſtribute, *omnem Terram* Scotiæ *hominibus ſuis*: and it is not to be concluded, that this was the firſt time that our Country was ſo call'd. And about that time *Ireland* was expreſſed only by the name of *Hibernia*; for King *Henry* the 2d of *England*, who began to Reign

in the Year 1154, is ſtiled *Lord of Ireland.*

And to clear further that *Scotia* about thoſe times was the ordinary name for *Scotland*, and *Hibernia* for *Ireland*, I ſhall only add ſome few Paſſages out of *Marianus Scotus*, who was born in the Year 1028, and died in the Year 1086, * who ſayes, that about the Year 1016, *Brianus, King of* Ireland, *was killed*; and a little thereafter, † at the Year 1034. *Malcolm King of* Scotland *died, and* Duncan *the Son of his Daughter ſucceeded him.* And after that he ſayes, at the Year 1040, * Duncan *King of* Scotland, was *killed, and the ſon of* Finlay *ſucceeded in his Kingdom*, whom afterward † he calls * *Machetad* King of *Scotland.* All which paſſages agree exactly with our Hiſtory, and the ſummary of our Kings Lives, as they are recorded in our Acts of Parliament, and prove that *Marianus* treats of *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, as different Kingdoms in his Time.

* Brianus *Rex* Hiberniæ *necatur.* pag. 423.

† Moelcolium *Rex* Scotiæ *obiit*, Donchad *filius filiæ ejus ſibi ſucceſſit.* pag. 424.

* Donchad *Rex* Scotiæ *occiditur & Mefinlaech ſucceſſit in Regnum ejus.* p. 425.

† Pag. 427.

* Mackbeth.

In

In the laſt place, I ſhall make ſome Remarks upon the moſt palpable of theſe Miſtakes, and of the chief Authors thereof: wherein I ſhall vindicate the Right and Dignity of our Country, and aſſert theſe worthy Perſons controverted to be ours. I ſhall not inſiſt much againſt *Stanihurſt*, he being ſolidly confuted by * *Camerarius*, and with that ſeverity by *Dempſter*, that his Nephew Biſhop *Uſher* (as the Duke of *Lauderdail* remarked in ſome Judicious Reflections of his upon this occaſion) did highly reſent it, and in this Matter hath exceeded his uſual Temperament and Moderation. And yet *Stanihurſt* never ſpeaks injuriouſly of our Nation; for though he miſtakes many things, and applys them to his own Country; yet it appears to be, rather of Deſign to magnifie it, than injure ours: for he acknowledeth ingenuouſly,* *That he doth not clearly ſee from what time the Name of* Scotland *commenced.* And though thereafter he taxeth *Boethius* upon the Subject of *Gathelus*

* *Appen. ad l.3.*

* Lib. 1. p. 17. *Verum à quo primum initio* Scotiæ *nomen ſit tractum, nondum plane perſpectum video.*

lus and *Scota*, and that he mixeth Fables and Vain glory with his Hiſtory; yet he neither diſapproves of *Buchannan*, nor follows he *Luddus*, both of whom he cites, and who were immediatly before him; his Book being printed at *Antwerp*, in the Year 1584. In his Appendix alſo, Commenting upon *Giraldus Cambrenſis* (a *Welſh-man*, and *Secretary* to King *Henry* 2*d* of *England*, and flouriſhed before the end of the 12*th* Century) He tranſlates *Cambrenſis*, who deſcribes *Ireland* by the name of *Hibernia*, and makes frequent mention of our Country under the name of *Scotia*; as when he ſpeaks of the extent of *Ireland*, he ſays (as *Stanihurſt* interprets it) that * *it is equal in largeneſs to* Wales *and* Scotland. And elſewhere he ſays, that † *Scotland is called the North part of the Iſle of* Britain. And afterwards he tells the Story of *Mo*reds ſix Sons, and that from them the Inhabitants of the North part of *Britain*, * *by a ſpecifick word, were called the* Scotiſh *Nation*. And *Stanihurſt* in his Annotations on theſe two

* *Quantæ circumſcriptis* Wallia *&* Scotia *potior inſula* Britannicæ *pars Regibuſq; antiquis appropriata.* pag. 223.

† Scotia *quoque pars Inſulæ* Britannicæ *dicitur Aquilonaris.* p. 245.

* *Specificato vocabulo gens* Scotica *appellatur.* cap. 19.

two Chapters contends, that before St. *Patrick*'s time our Country was called *Scotia*; and brings for proofs St. *Jerome*, who asserts that the Scots were *Gens Britannica*; but with great concern he vindicates us from the calumny of eating Mens Flesh: and for our Antiquity he cites *Beda*, who says, that *Sub duce Rendâ* we made a third Nation in *Britain*. So that we see that neither the Welsh in *Giraldus*'s time, nor the Irish in *Stanihurst*'s time, had the Opinion of our late Settlement, and that our Country was not call'd *Scotia* for 1000 Years after Christ; which their Successors *Luddus*, *Cambden*, *Usher* and St. *Asaph* have had. And the *Irish* in those days took a far better way for advancing their own interest in doing us justice; since from all the considerable Actions we did, there did arise a measure of that Honour to them, from whose Country we came as a Colony: Whereas since they were influenc'd by Strangers, they have suffer'd themselves to be impos'd upon, so as to lessen our true Merit, in appropri-

ating

ating immediatly to themſelves thoſe devout perſons, who were really our Country-men: not conſidering that the material unjuſtice was much greater than the imaginary honour: And this *Plagiariſm* and *Man-ſtealing* became eaſie to them ſince our Reformation from Popery, becauſe after that time we became too careleſs of thoſe eminent Perſons both at home and abroad, who had liv'd in the Roman Communion, or before that time. But I will not inſiſt on this, for I hope their native kindneſs will incline them to return to their firſt juſt methods.

* Pag. 789. If I had leiſure, I would make larger Reflections, to prove how unconſequential Arch Bp *Uſher* is, in making *Sedulus* and *Marianus* Iriſh: ſince by all Writers they are both call'd *Scots*, and *Balæus* an Engliſhman tells us, that † *Sedulius* flouriſh'd under *Fergus* 2*d*. and * *Marianus* under *Macbeth*, both our Kings; and *Baronius* aſſerts alſo this poſitively. And *Sedulius* having liv'd before St. *Patrick*'s Time (who was the firſt Apoſtle of *Ireland*) and

† Pag. 187. Cent. 14.
* Pag. 210. Cent. 14.

and being Disciple to *Hildebert* an acknowledg'd Scot, and who liv'd in the 390, must be prior to the Irish Christianity; which *Giraldus* and *Stanihurst* acknowledge to have been first planted by St. *Patrick* in the Year 432. Nor can * *Usher* in all his vast reading, find any Christians in *Ireland* betwixt the Year 400, and 432, which was St. *Patrick*'s Time, but *Kiaranus*, *Ailbeus*, *Declanus*, *Ibarus*: Tho if *Sedulius* had been an Irish, he had been certainly mention'd and employ'd, before those obscure Persons; and certainly he would have employed himself before St. *Patrick*'s Time in the Conversion of his own native Country, if he had been truly Irish. And as to *Marianus Scotus*, it is a wonder how it can be controverted that he was a Scots-man; since our Country was then called *Scotland* by the Bp of St. *Asaph*'s own confession; and *Ireland* was just then losing that name; and *Marianus* in his whole Book distinguishes betwixt *Scoti* and *Hiberni*, and mentions the forementioned three Kings of *Scotland* about whose Time

* Pag. 789.

Time he liv'd; and alſo makes mention of one King of *Ireland* about that time: as has been obſerved already; and particularly, ſpeaking of the Converſions * by *Palladius* and St. *Patrick*, he expreſly diſtinguiſhes betwixt *Scoti*, and *Hibernenſes*.

But paſſing theſe, I confeſs it is pretty ridiculous to ſee a whole Book written by the above-mentioned *Vardæus*, and gloſſed by *Sirin*, and publiſhed at *Louvain* 1662, to prove that *Rumoldus* Arch-Biſhop of *Mechlin* was an Iriſh-man: ſince the Arms of *Scotland* (which are, *Or, a Lion Rampant Gules, within a doubles Treſſure flowred and counterflowred with Flower de lis of the ſame*) are plac'd upon every Window of the Catherdral Church built by him, and are to this day a part of the Arms of that Archi-Epiſcopal See, *Rumoldus* himſelf being a younger Brother of the *Royal-Family* of *Scotland*: And in which witty Book, the Author, to confute this, * is forced to maintain that the Scotiſh Lion is born by ſeveral Iriſh Familes; And the double Treſſure, tho anciently born

* *Ad* Scotos *in* Chriſtum *credentes ordinatus à* Papa *Cæleſtino* Palladius *primus Epiſcopus miſſus eſt. Poſt ipſum* Sanctus Patricius *conſecratus & ad* Archiepiſcopum Hibernenſem *mittitur, & totam inſulam* Hiberniam *convertit ad fidem.* pag. 340.

* Artic. 4. & pag. 281.

born by *Scotland*, and which is Blazon'd in that Archi-Epiſcopal Coat of Arms, might have been born by the Iriſh, becauſe that famous League betwixt the Scots and *Charlemaigne*, was made with the Kings of *Ireland*, and not with the Kings of *Scotland*; and that our Kings had never any Leagues with the *French*, till the reign of *Charles* 7th who was contemporary with our King *James* 1ſt: Whereas the whole French Hiſtories, as well as ours; and all Foreign Hiſtorians, as well as either, the Leagues yet extant; the Priviledges granted thereupon to us, recorded in the French Regiſters, and ours; many Deciſions in Parliaments, and other Courts; and the univerſal conſent of all the French who ever liv'd ſince that Time, do in all Humility ſeem to be ſufficient Warrants for laughing at this monſtruous Aſſertion; as I do at him and others, who pretend that the Scotiſh Monaſteries in *Germany*, are Iriſh: ſince they were founded in *Charle-Maigne*'s Time, by *William* Brother to our King *Achaius*, and

others

others that went there with him; and they are to this day govern'd by Abbots and Priors of our Country: Nor can it be underſtood, how the *French* and *Germans* could miſtake their own Records and *Foundations* for ſo many hundreds of Years togeder, and by this I leave my Reader to meaſure the other unjuſt pretenſions of ſuch Authors.

I hope it now at laſt appears, that I have detected thoſe ingenious Artifices, which this learn'd Biſhop was forc'd to uſe, to ſupply his want of ſolid and juſt grounds in this his undertaking. As,

1. That, to conciliate reſpect to this Undertaking, as well as to excuſe it, he pretends that it was neceſſary for the defence of Epiſcopacy.

2. He makes a great muſter of old Authors in the beginning of his Book, as if all theſe were Men of great credit, and did concur with him to refute our Hiſtory; and adorns his Margins with formidable numbers of Citations.

3. Know-

3. Knowing that it could be prov'd, both by Britiſh and Foreign Hiſtorians, that we were here very anciently, he confeſſes this; but by a new and ſtrange Invention, he aſſerts that we were not here as ſettled Inhabitants, but only by way of Incurſion.

4. He defers our Setling here, till the Year 503, and ſo longer than the firſt Inventors of this new Story did; upon deſign to make our Settlement here, later then that of the *Anglo-Saxons*, who ſettl'd here in *Anno* 449.

5. He leſſens the reputation of all our Hiſtorians, and endeavours alſo to make them paſs but for one; as if the ſucceeding Hiſtorian had ſeen no other Warrants, but the preceeding Hiſtories.

6. He treats in ridicule *Jeffrey*, and ſome other Hiſtorians of his own Country, whom he knew could not be ſuſtain'd however; and this he does upon deſign, to ſhew his impartiality, and that he ſpares not his own more than ours.

7. For the ſame reaſon he decrys the Britiſh deſcent from *Brutus*: in which he loſes nothing, becauſe no ſober Man could have defended it; and he denies the Converſion of their own King *Lucius*, to ſtrike thereby with the greater authority at the Antiquity of our *Royal-Line* and *Nation*, treating King *Donald*'s Converſion alſo as a Fable: and thus according to our Proverb, *He is content to let a Friend go with a Foe.*

8. He complements our Nation in latter Times, to excuſe the Injury he does our Kings and Antiquity.

9. He uſes the Foreign Authors that ſhould be urg'd for us, to prevent our uſing of them as proving Arguments againſt him.

10. Finding that *Ireland* has been call'd *Scotia*, he tranſplants our old Saints thither, and applies to it, all that is ſaid of our Country: nor did ever any Author improve better a pitiful Clinch.

11. He concurs in another deſign like to this: for, becauſe it could not be deny'd that *Fergus* was

was our first King; all the Citations for proving this, are therefore apply'd to *Fergus* the Second, and not to *Fergus* the First.

Lastly; Whereas *Cambden* and Arch-bishop *Usher* speak doubtingly of their own Arguments; the Bishop of St. *Asaph* fearing that his Reader could not be convinc'd, of what himself was not, he therefore proposes all these Arguments, with a confidence, which would seem to argue that full conviction in himself, which he wishes in others.

If any Person then would know how that *Scotland*, which was but a small Colony, grew up to a Kingdom that deserv'd so well: my thoughts of this are, that, 1. The constant defence that we were oblig'd to make against the *Romans* and *Britons* at first, and *English* thereafter, Nations wise, brave, and polish'd, living in the same Isle with us, and the *Picts* within us, did force us to think and fight; and the observing the Actions & Conduct of such Enemies could not leave the observers

rude or ignorant: and it's like that the Glory of ſuch Noble Adverſaries, rais'd our Wit and Courage above the pitch of a Northen and confin'd Nation. 2. Our Country having had the happineſs to ſtop the *Roman* Conqueſt, this gave Strangers a value for us; and therefore when any of the gallant *Britons* ſcorn'd to ſubmit to the ſlavery and drudgery of a Conqueſt, they fled unto us from the *Romans*, *Saxons*, *Danes*, and *Normans*; and being paſſionate lovers of Liberty, they animated us by their Aſſiſtance and Example. This likewiſe brought in brave Strangers amongſt us, as all gallant Spirits did lately run to *Holland* in its firſt riſe: and (as our Hiſtorians probably relate) very many of thoſe return'd with *Fergus* the Second from the Wars in *Italy*, whither that generous young Prince went to aſſiſt *Alarick* againſt the *Romans*, in a juſt reſentment of the injury done by them to his Predeceſſors, and with whom he was preſent at the ſacking of *Rome*. 3. We have been very happy in ſo Heroick and Wiſe a Race of Kings, whoſe

whoſe Blood being refin'd by a long Royal Deſcent, hath been thereby purifiy'd from all meanneſs, and elevated to that Love for glory, which is ordinary in thoſe, who never knew what it was to obey. 4. Our Country having entered early into a remarkable League with *France*, in the Reign of *Charle-Maigne*; our Country-men got excellent Breeding, under ſo Wiſe and Valiant a Prince; and have ever ſince, by being conſtantly employed in the *French*, and other Wars, attain'd to a degree of Merit, beyond what was to be expected in this Climate. 5. Our Country having neither Bogs nor Fogs, our Ground being Rocky and Gravelly, aud our Air fann'd by Winds; this preſerves us from the dulneſs and phlegm of the Northern Climats; and the want of that ſuperfluous Plenty, and bewitching Pleaſure, which ſoftned even *Hannibal* when he came to *Capua*, preſerves us againſt the Delicacy and Effeminateneſs of Southern Nations. And whereas (Heroick Virtue being ſtill attended by Envy) ſome

in railery pretend, that we were unconquer'd, becauſe we deſerv'd not the pains and trouble of a War. I need not ſeriouſly anſwer, what no Hiſtorian can urge: For it is ridiculous to think, that the *Romans* would not have rather conquer'd us, than built two ſtrong and expenſive Walls againſt us, which bounded their Fame, as well as their Conqueſt. And *England* hath taken too much pains to gain us, either by Conqueſt or Alliance, to have undervalued us. And though when we were divided by the differences betwixt the *Bruce* and *Barliol* of old, and betwixt the *Royaliſts* and *Covenanters* of late; the half of our Country having only defended its Liberties, whilſt the other half joyn'd with its Enemies; we were rather betray'd than overcome: And yet we ſoon recovered our former Liberty. Albeit, to be overcome by *England* had been no great affront to us; *England* being a greater and richer Nation than we are. And therefore I hope, all honeſt Men will, with Judicious

Samuel

Samuel Daniel in his Hiſtory, at the Year 1296, confeſs, that it had been a pity, we had not had a better Country, to be the Theatre of ſo many worthy and heroick Actions.

Having thus clear'd how our Nation arriv'd at its preſent conſiſtence, I am to finiſh this Diſcourſe, with a repreſentation of the many Rights which our Kings have to the *Imperial Throne* of theſe Kingdoms; and to ſhow how they ſucceed to all who ever pretended to Monarchy in any of them.

As to the Britiſh part of the Iſle, *Aurelius Ambroſius* was, by common conſent, choſen ſole Prince of all the *Britons*: And he had no other Succeſſion, ſave two Daughters, *Anna* married to the King of the *Picts*, and *Ada* married to the King of the *Scots*. *Mordredus* King of the *Picts*, Grand-child to the foreſaid *Aurelius*, finding himſelf debarr'd from the Succeſſion of the Britiſh Crown, employ'd the Scots, who

fought for him againſt the *Britons*. But the *Britons* having called in the *Saxons*, after a bloody Battel, both Parties were forced to withdraw; and the King of the *Picts* was induc'd to deſiſt from his Pretentions at that time. But thereafter *Hungus*, King of the *Picts*, and the direct Heir of the ſame *Mordredus*, and conſequently of *Ambroſius* King of the *Britons*, gave his Siſter *Ferguſiana* to *Achaius* King of the *Scots*; and in her Right, *Alpin* King of *Scotland* ſucceeded both to the Britiſh and Pictiſh Crowns; *Hungus* having died without any Children, *Kenneth* the 2*d*, Son to *Alpin*, was forc'd to conquer the *Picts*, who refus'd unjuſtly to receive him as their lawful King.

Our Kings are likewiſe Lineal Heirs of the Daniſh-Race, who were Kings of *England* for 27, or as others ſay, 29 Years; they being the only Lineal Succeſſors of *Canutus* King of the *Danes* in *Britain*: for *Margaret*, Wife to King *Malcolm* the 3*d*, was Siſter to *Edgar*, which *Edgar* was

was Grand-child to St. *Edward*, who was Brother to *Hardiknut*, Son to *Canutus*.

After this the Kingdom of *England* return'd to the old Stock in King *Edward*'s Time; to whom ſucceeded *Edgar*, whoſe Siſter the pious Queen *Margaret* married King *Malcolm* the 3d of *Scotland*, by whom he came to have right to the Crown of *England*; there being none extant of the old *Royal-Saxon-Line* beſides her ſelf: And with her came very many of the Nobility, who fled from *William the Conquerour*, after he conquer'd *England*, and with whom King *Malcolm* would not make Peace, till ſuch of them as reſolved to return were reſtored to their Eſtates.

The next *Royal-Race* which flouriſhed in *England*, was the *Norman*; and to that Race our Kings ſucceeded thus.

The Line of *William the Conqueror* was branch'd out in the Houſes of *Lancaſter* and *York*. To the Houſe of *Lan-*

Lancaſter, they ſucceed as Heirs by the marriage betwixt *Joan* Daughter to the Duke of *Somerſet*, and undoubted Succeſſor of the Family of *Lancaſter*. And to both *Lancaſter* and *York* they ſucceed, by being Heirs to *Henry* the *7th*; in whom theſe Succeſſions were again happily reconcil'd; he having married *Elizabeth* eldeſt Daughter to *Edward* the *4th*, who had transferred the Succeſſion of the *Crown* from the Houſe of *Lancaſter*, to that of *York*, or at leaſt had united the two in one. For clearing whereof, it is fit to know, that *Henry* the *7th* had only four Children, *Arthur*, *Henry*, *Margaret*, and *Mary*. *Arthur*, and *Henry* dying without Succeſſion, the Right of the *Crown* was certainly devolv'd upon the Children of *Margaret* the Daughter; who did bear King *James* the *5th*, in a firſt Marriage with King *James* the *4th*; and *Margaret Dowglas*, by a ſecond Marriage with the Earl of *Angus*: which *Margaret* being married to *Matthew* Earl of *Lenox*, had two Sons; the eldeſt whereof was *Henry*, who

who thereafter married Queen *Mary* Daughter to King *James* the *5th*; and begot upon her King *James* the *6th*: and thus King *James* the *6th* was upon all ſides Heir to *William the Conquerour*, and to *Henry* the *7th*.

The Hiſtories alſo of both Nations confeſs, that our King is the undoubted Succeſſor of the *Blood-Royal* of *Wales*: for *Walter Stuart*, from whom our Kings are deſcended, was Grand-Child to the King of *Wales*, by his Daughter, * who married *Fleanchus* Son to † *Banqhuo*: and *Henry* the *7th* (to whom King *James* the *6th* was the true Succeſſor) was alſo the righteous Heir of *Cadwallader* the laſt Prince of *Wales*.

* *Leſl. in vita Dav.* 2.
† *Baker*, p. 159. *Edit.* 1643.

The Hiſtories both of *Scotland* and *Ireland* do acknowledg, that our Kings are undoubtedly deſcended from the Royal Race of the Kings of *Ireland*; and all the debate that can be, is only whether they be deſended from King *Ferquhard*, Father

ther to King *Fergus* the firſt, or from *Eric* Father to King *Fergus* the ſecond; or from ſome other Iriſh Kings, as *Uſher* pretends.

From all which I may draw two Concluſions; Firſt, that God has, from an extraordinary kindneſs to thoſe Kingdoms, lodged in the Perſon of our preſent Soveraign, King *James* the *7th* (whom *GOD Almighty* long preſeve) all thoſe oppoſite, and different Rights, by which our Peace might have been formerly diſturb'd. 2. That His *Majeſty* who now Reigns, has deriv'd from His Royal Anceſtors, a juſt and legal Right by Law, to all thoſe Crowns, without needing to found upon the Right of Conqueſt: ſo that the very endeavour, to exclude him from all thoſe Legal Rights, by Arbitrary Inſolence, under a Mask of Law, was the height of Injuſtice, as well as Imprudence.

FINIS.

Books Printed for, and Sold by *RICHARD CHISWELL.*

FOLIO.

Speed's Maps and Geography of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, and of Foreign Parts.

Dr. *Cave*'s Lives of the Primitive Fathers, in 2 Vol.

Dr. *Cary*'s Chronological Account of Ancient Time.

Bp *Wilkins* real Character, or Philosophical Language.

Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.

Guillim's Display of Heraldry, with large Additions.

Dr. *Burnet*'s History of the Reformation of the Church of *England*, in 2 Vol.

---Account of the Confessions and Prayers of the Murderers of Esquire *Twynn*.

Burlace's History of the Irish Rebellion.

Herodoti Historia, Gr. Lat. cum variis Lect.

The Laws of this Realm concerning Jesuits, Seminary Priests, Recusants, the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance explained by divers Judgments and Resolutions of the *Judges*; with other Observations thereupon. By *William Cawley* Esq;.

Sanford's Genealogical Hist. of the Kings of *England*.

Modern Reports of select Cases, in the reign of King *Charles* the 2*d*.

Sir *Tho. Murray*'s Collection of the Laws of *Scotland*.

Dr. *Towerson*'s Explication on the Creed, the Commandments, and Lord's Prayer, in 3 Vol.

The History of the Island of *CEYLON* in the *East-Indies:* Illustrated with Copper Figures; and an exact Map of the Island. By Capt. *Robert Knox*, a Captive there near 20 Years.

QUARTO.

DR. *Littleton*'s Dictionary, Latin and English.

Bp *Nicholson* on the Church-Catechism.

History of the late Wars of *New-England*.

Atwell's Faithful Surveyer.

Mr. *John Cave*'s seven occasional Sermons.

Dr. *Crawford*'s Serious Expostulation with the Whigs in *Scotland*.

Dr. *Parker*'s Demonstration of the Divine Authothority of the Law of Nature, and the Christian Religion.

Mr.

Mr. *Hook*'s new Philoſophical Collections.
Bibliotheca Norfolciana.

OCTAVO.

BIſhop *Wilkin*'s Natural Religion.
----His Fifteen Sermons.
Mr. *Tanner*'s *Primordia:* Or, the Riſe and Growth of the firſt Church of God deſcribed.
Lord *Hollis*'s Vindication of the Judicature of the Houſe of Peers, in the Caſe of *Skinner.*
----Juriſdiction of the Houſe of Peers in caſe of Appeals.
----Juriſdiction of the Houſe of Peers in caſe of Impoſitions.
----Letters about the Biſhops Votes in Capital Caſes.
Spaniards Conſpiracy againſt the State of *Venice.*
Dr. *Sympſon*'s Chymical Anatomy of the *York-ſhire* Spaws: With a Diſcourſe of the Original of hot Springs and other Fountains.
Dr. *Cave*'s Primitive Chriſtianity, in three parts.
Ignatius Fuller's Sermons of Peace and Holineſs.
The Trials of the Regicides, in 1660.
Certain genuine Remains of the Lord *Bacon*, in Arguments Civil, Moral, Natural, *&c.* with a large account of all his Works. By Dr. *Tho. Tenniſon.*
Dr. *Puller* of the Moderation of the Church of *England.*
Sir *John Mounſon* of Supream Power and Common Right.
Dr. *Henry Bagſhaw* Diſcourſe on ſelect Texts.
Mr. *Seller*'s State of the Church in the three firſt Centuries.
The Country-mans Phyſician.
Dr. *Burnet*'s Account of the Life and Death of the Earl of *Rocheſter.*
----Vindication of the Ordination of the Church of *England.*
----Hiſtory of the Rights of Princes in the Diſpoſing of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices and Church-lands.
----Relation of the preſent ſtate of the difference between the *French* King and the Court of *Rome*; to which is added, the Pope's Brief to the Aſſembly of the Clergy, and their Proteſtation, publiſhed by Dr. *Burnet.*

Abridg-

Books ſold by Richard Chiſwell.

----Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation,
Ogleby's *Æſops Fables* paraphraſed in Verſe, and adorned with Sculptures and Annotations, in 2 Vol.
Dr. *Cumber*'s Companion to the Altar.
Galliard's two Diſcourſes of private Settlement at Home after Travel, and of Him who is in Publick Employments.
Markham's Perfect Horſeman.
Dr. *Sherlock*'s Practical Diſcourſe of Religious Aſſemblies.
----Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s Unreaſonableneſs of Separation.
----A Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in anſwer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lob* about Catholick Communion.
The Hiſtory of the Houſe of *Eſtee*, the Family of the Dutcheſs of *York*, now Queen of *England*.
Sir *Rob. Filmer*'s *Patriarcha*, or natural Power of Kings.
Mr. *John Cave*'s Goſpel to the *Romans*.
Lawrence's Intereſt of *Ireland*, in its Trade and Wealth, ſtated.

DUODECIMO.

Hodder's Arithmetick.
An Apology for a Treatiſe of Humane Reaſon. Written by *M. Cliford* Eſq;.
Queen-like-Cloſet, both Parts.
Biſhop *Wettenhalls* Method and Order for Private Devotion.

VICESSIMO QUARTO.

Valentine's Private Devotions.
Crums of Comfort.

Books lately printed for Ri. Chiſwell.

FOLIO.

DR. *Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus & earum Rationibus.*
Sir *James Turner*'s *Pallas Armata*, or Military Eſſays of the Ancient *Grecian*, *Roman*, and Modern Art of War.
Dr. *John Lightfoot*'s Works in *Engliſh*, in 2 Vol.

Mr.

Mr. *Selden*'s *Janus Anglorum* Engliſhed, with Notes: To which is added his *Epinomis*, concerning the ancient Government and Laws of this Kingdom, never before extant. Alſo two other Treatiſes written by the ſame Author: One of the Original of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdictions of Teſtaments; the other of the Diſpoſition or Adminiſtration of Inteſtates Goods; Now the firſt time publiſhed.

QUARTO.

Patris Simonii Diſquiſitiones Criticæ de Variis per diverſa Loca & Tempora Bibliorum Editionibus. Accedunt Caſtigat. Opuſc. Iſ. Voſſii de Sibyllinis Oraculis.

Dr. *Falkner*'s two Treatiſes of Reproaching and Cenſure: with his Anſwer to *Serjeant*'s *Surefooting*: Alſo ſeveral occaſional Sermons.

The Caſe of Lay-Communion with the Church of *England* conſidered.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue.

A Diſcourſe of the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

OCTAVO.

DR. *William Cave*'s Diſſertation concerning the Government of the Ancient Church by Biſhops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs.

Two Letters betwixt Mr. *R. Smith*, and Dr. *Hen. Hammond*, about Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell.

Dean *Stratford*'s Diſſwaſive from Revenge.

The Life of Biſhop *Bedel*.

Dr. *Harris* his rational Diſcourſe of Remedies.

Sir *George Mackenzy*'s Juſt Right of Monarchy.

Dr. *Hez. Burton*'s firſt Volume of Diſcourſes, of Purity and Charity; of Repentaace, and of ſeeking the Kingdom of God. Publiſhed by Dean *Tillotſon*.

---His ſecond Vol. of Diſcourſes upon divers other Practical Subjects.

Sir *Thomas More*'s *Utopia*, newly made Engliſh.

Biſhop *Jewel*'s Apology for the Church of *England*; with his Life. By a Perſon of Quality.

306081